

hearts, and the hope of humanity's highest dreams. By Thy wondrous grace, keep us calm, trustful, patient, steady, and obedient to Thy holy will as revealed in Jesus Christ. And with Thy never-failing help, may we prefer the things that are excellent, as well as choose what is right and to right what is wrong.

In the name of Him who taught us to love one another even as Christ Himself has loved us, we earnestly and gratefully pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, February 4, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) to permit the importation free of duty of flaxseed from foreign countries during a period of 90 days, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) to permit the importation free of duty of flaxseed from foreign countries during a period of 90 days was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. CLARK of Idaho). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Davis	Moore
Bailey	Eastland	O'Daniel
Ball	Ferguson	Overton
Barkley	George	Robertson
Brewster	Green	Taft
Brooks	Guffey	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Hill	Tobey
Butler	Holman	Tunnell
Byrd	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	White
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	
Danaher	McKellar	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] is absent, attending the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent, on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably absent due to having an appointment with Governor Walter E. Edge, of the State of New Jersey, for the purpose of discussing the soldiers' vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NYE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WAGNER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the difficulty of obtaining a quorum today, I make the only motion that is in order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes a. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, bewildered by the wild confusion without in a clamorous world we would wait in quietness that the roiled waters may become clear and our disturbed spirits tranquil pools of peace

and prayer. In the black night that covers us we would keep our bearings by the upward look, where the pilgrim stars of eternal verities flash their guiding signals upon our darkened way. Put Thy hands upon our hands as the ship of state is steered through these mountainous seas.

Thou knowest our hearts. Thou seest, in spite of the worst things in us which we despise, that in our highest hours our deepest desire is to be the true servants of Thy will in this troubled time. Grant us the grace, O Lord, to cherish evermore the heritage that is ours through the might and meekness, the virtue and valor of those whose record within these Halls has helped make the greatness of our Nation; and inspire us so to follow their shining example that we may not only hold our inheritance as a sacred and precious trust but, by our love and labor, leave it with increased luster to those who shall come after us. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PEPPER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, February 5, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRIBUTE TO SERVICES OF SENATOR MCCARRAN AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the records of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate in commendation of the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], during the last year. The matter I present was adopted at a recent meeting of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following excerpt is from the record of the final session of the Senate District Committee, presided over by Senator MCCARRAN, prior to assuming the duties of Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Senator BURTON. As a Member of the committee and as a Member of the minority party on the committee, I wish to express appreciation of your leadership in this difficult assignment. I believe, Mr. Chairman, you have set an example as to what a chairman of the Senate District Committee should be. You have displayed those virtues of administration which I regard as most vital and which are not always to be found in a position of this kind. I refer to the virtues of fairness, firmness, and kindness which you have shown in this committee work which involves city government, and deals with many questions of human interest. You have shown an appropriate human interest. This work is different in a way from all other work of Congress because it deals indirectly with the human beings themselves and the leadership which you have given in approaching this problem has been extremely helpful to the members of the committee. You have always shown a desire to take the long view and to look consistently to the ultimate and best solution. You have at all times disregarded any partisan or personal consideration, and I believe that the District of Columbia and the Congress and members of the committee are deeply indebted to you for your services.

"I will be only too glad to assist in whatever way I can with the many things that are still pending. I wish to thank you personally and as a member of the minority party I would like to say that I endorse your committee program, and we are very sorry to lose you as chairman.

"Senator CAPPER. I want to endorse 100 percent everything that Senator BURTON has said.

"Senator BUCK. I am in hearty accord with the sentiments expressed by Senator BURTON, and I, too, regret losing Senator McCARRAN as chairman of the District Committee. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the chairman for his untiring efforts, human understanding, and kindness throughout his entire tenure as chairman.

"Senator BUSHFIELD. During my previous year of service on this committee under your chairmanship and leadership, I found you unfailingly helpful and loyal and responsive to any request made by the members of the committee; and as all members have that view, I think it is entirely appropriate that these expressions of appreciation to our chairman for his services, for his leadership, and for his long hours of work on this committee, be formally made a part of the records of the committee, and I so move."

(Senator BUSHFIELD put this motion, which was carried unanimously, the chairman not voting.)

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Thelma V. Griffith, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces, which was ordered to lie on the table.

SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL—PETITIONS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have before me a letter addressed to me which I shall read:

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed are petitions bearing more than 500 signatures urging you vote for a federally controlled servicemen's ballot as the only effective means of permitting our men and women in the armed forces to vote in this year's national elections. Our membership have officially backed this question and hundreds more Springfield workers would have signed these petitions, given time.

We can assure you that sentiment is overwhelmingly in favor of the Federal ballot

and urge you not only to vote but to work for the success of the measure.

Very truly yours,
FRED R. SNOW,
President, Local 218, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

The petitions were posted from Springfield, Vt. I ask unanimous consent to have noted the presentation of the petitions and to have them properly referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be noted and lie on the table.

A CITIZEN'S DIFFICULTY WITH INCOME-TAX RETURN

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I suppose even the most ardent Floridian would admit that beautiful San Diego has the most halcyon, salubrious, and soothing climate in the United States. I was therefore surprised to receive from Mr. Frank H. Warren, of San Diego, Calif., the following card:

MY DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: I hope you roast a thousand years in hell for each minute I put in on this Federal income-tax report.

FRANK H. WARREN.

Mr. President, I cannot obey the injunction of Mr. Warren, but I can express sympathy for him and for the unhappy state of mind he must have been in after making out his income-tax report. Millions of Americans will sympathize with Mr. Warren and I hope that Congress will soon move energetically to simplify income-tax procedure.

CITATION OF MAJ. GEN. RICHARD C. MOORE

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the citation for distinguished service of Maj. Gen. Richard C. Moore, who was formerly stationed at Kansas City, Mo., as chief of engineers.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Maj. Gen. Richard C. Moore, United States Army. For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility as assistant chief of staff for requirements, headquarters, Army Ground Forces, from March 9, 1942, to October 2, 1943. In this assignment Major General Moore was charged with the testing of equipment for the Army Ground Forces, the preparation of tables of organization and training literature, and the determination of the priorities in which equipment should be furnished commensurate with the availability of industrial facilities. By the exercise of sound judgment, executive ability, tact, leadership, foresight, patience, and intelligence, Major General Moore was able to accomplish his assigned tasks efficiently and thus contribute materially to the early introduction into combat of much of the modern equipment used so effectively by our troops in battle.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, so many members of the staffs of various Senators have called my office requesting the latest information available in regard to American prisoners of war in the Far East that I have prepared

a brief statement which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I believe it will be of service to the staffs of various Senators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Another sordid chapter was added to the story of Pearl Harbor during the past week when the reports of Japanese atrocities against American prisoners of war were made known to the public. The leading characters of the story needed no introduction. Previous performances in the same role have made them well known, and there is very little reason to believe that they will soon be forgotten. The people of China know the story only too well, but to most Americans it came as a sickening revelation, and to a few as a dreaded confirmation of only half-hidden fears that Americans were suffering the same outrages which we all knew had been inflicted upon the citizens and soldiers of other countries occupied and ravished by the Japanese.

Upon the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan, our Government confirmed its intention to observe the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention, to insure humane treatment for American nationals in Japanese hands. The Japanese Government thereupon notified our Government that it would apply the provisions of the convention to the treatment of American prisoners of war, and also gave us assurances that it would apply the provisions of the Geneva Red Cross Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the sick and wounded. These conventions specify that prisoners of war shall be treated humanely and held in honorable captivity and not treated as criminals. Despite these assurances, however, this Government has been confronted with problems which are almost insurmountable in its efforts to negotiate with the Japanese Government. For instance, Japan makes a differentiation between the prisoners held in the Philippines and the prisoners held in Japan proper, the Philippines being regarded as captured territory and persons captured being considered to be in a different category from those interned in Tokyo. After repeated efforts upon the part of our Government, and long delays, the Japanese refused to honor the provision of the convention which obligated them to repatriate sick and wounded prisoners of war.

Similar insurmountable difficulties have confronted our efforts to get relief supplies, consisting of food, clothing, and medicine, to our prisoners of war and to our civilian internees. The only way we can come into contact with a country such as Japan is through Switzerland. Switzerland represents the United States in negotiations with Japan. After almost a year and a half of repeated representations on the part of our Government stressing the responsibility of Japan to cooperate in solving the problem of relief, the Japanese Government stated that it might consent to receive supplies overland or by sea from Soviet territory. Since that time long and complicated negotiations with the Japanese and Soviet Governments have ensued, the progress of which was impaired by the fact that the Japanese Government would not discuss the problem directly with the Soviet government while the Swiss Government, which is in charge of our interests in Japan, is not represented at Moscow, since it maintains no diplomatic relations with the Soviet government. Each detail of the negotiations had, therefore, to be dealt with through a long and complicated procedure involving the handling of communications at Tokyo, Bern, Washington, and Moscow, and in reverse direction through the same channels. Despite these difficulties, it has now been possible with the Soviet Government's cooperation to create a stock pile of

prisoner-of-war relief supplies on Soviet territory. Moreover, the Soviet Government has given assurances that it will facilitate the transit through the Soviet Union of such relief supplies on a continuing basis when a satisfactory arrangement for the onward shipment of these supplies is reached between the Japanese and American Governments. In spite of our State Department's repeated endeavors to bring this matter to a conclusion, the Japanese Government has not thus far indicated the means by which it is prepared to receive these supplies. Secretary Cordell Hull revealed this week that a total of 89 protests, culminating in an 18-point indictment of Tokyo's barbarities toward war prisoners, disregard of prison-camp rules and refusal to let our neutral representative, Switzerland, inspect the camps, have been delivered to the Japanese authorities. It is little wonder that the word "hopeless" was used to describe the situation.

There is no accurate way of measuring how deeply the American people were distressed upon learning of the Japanese cruelties. The circumstances surrounding the release of the newspaper accounts and the State Department's blunt description of its negotiations as hopeless, added to the sting of the story. But only those whose fathers, and brothers, and sons are in the hands of the Japanese know how much anguish and revulsion it brought. The people of New Mexico and Arizona know—for entire regiments of their National Guard were taken prisoner at Bataan. And some of our own people here in Utah know, too, the torment of wondering about the welfare of loved ones held prisoner by the enemy. It is true, too, that sometimes the severest pains are not discernible upon the surface, and though we cried out in anger and protest as a nation, and though we may have thought such things among ourselves as individuals, we all knew that there would be no retaliation in kind against the Japanese interned in this country. There have been no so-called incidents. A mayor of a small town in New Jersey ordered the police to stop a basketball game because three of the players were Japanese, though American citizens, and one the brother of a boy fighting with our troops in Italy. The mayor said that he feared for their safety. But when the boys came out upon the floor to play there was no demonstration by the crowd. Let it be said to our lasting credit as a nation that even with the sorest provocation we have not stooped to the degraded level of our enemy. But let him not think that because we have not done so we are inclined to forget or that his punishment is less certain. For when the full story is told it will be easier for the American people to forget the perfidy of Pearl Harbor than to forget the wanton brutality practiced by the Japanese in their treatment of American captives.

No one deprecates more strongly than I the contravention by the Japanese of the accepted principles of international understanding recognized by all civilized nations. My feeling is emphasized by the fact that I am in a position to know of the repeated and unceasing efforts by which the military authorities, the State Department, and the Red Cross, have sought to release and to relieve our suffering men; and especially because I know something about the grave difficulties which confront our efforts to help them. I was appointed chairman of a Military Affairs Subcommittee charged with the responsibility of determining whether or not a way might be found to solve this problem. Our committee acted in the full light of all available information upon the subject and was guided by the most competent military authority. Much of the information which we received was necessarily confidential and subject to the military censorship which applies to all information of this nature. Under these circumstances I sincerely believe that anyone sharing all the facts would agree

with me that in making public its reports the committee's paramount obligation was to the thousands of men still alive and still held by the Japanese. From the beginning our primary consideration has been for the lives and welfare of these men, and our aim has been to stop future atrocities. This should continue to be our first concern. Our outraged feelings must be tempered by the sobering fact that thousands of our men are still alive and cannot be immediately rescued from the hands of a cruel and merciless enemy.

I thank you.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Eyrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Connally	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	Wilson
Gerry	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a conference at the White House.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Iowa.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The further presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DANAHER. What is the question now pending before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The presentation of further petitions and memorials, as a part of the morning business.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

FOOD-STAMP PLAN—RESOLUTION OF SOUTHEAST KANSAS COUNTY OFFICIALS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record a resolution adopted by the committee on resolutions of the Southeast Kansas County Officials Association, meeting at Iola, Kans., January 13, 1944. This resolution protests against a resumption of the food-stamp plan, declares people on relief are now being amply cared for, and asks Members of Congress to oppose the plan.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to this protest, and urge careful consideration of all the factors involved before any action is taken in this direction. The matter undoubtedly will be fully discussed and explained during the consideration of the consumer food-subsidy proposals when the Senate proceeds to consider the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I send the resolution to the desk and request its appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We, the resolutions committee of Southeast Kansas County Officials Association in quarterly meeting assembled at Iola, Kans., this 13th day of January 1944, offer for your consideration the following resolution, to wit:

"Be it resolved, That inasmuch as there seems to be a movement in Washington to revive the stamp plan and that in the opinion of this body, that the people on relief are being amply cared for; that it is the opinion of this body that such a thing as the resumption of said stamp plan is not necessary; that this body go on record as against said stamp plan and urge our Senators and Representatives to not only vote against said plan but to work against said stamp plan and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives; to our Governor, and welfare board; also to all other district associations."

Chairman Callow moved the adoption of resolution. Motion seconded by Mr. Starr. Motion carried.

T. R. CALLOW,
Secretary, Southeast Kansas
County Officials Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

From the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

H. R. 2580. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 683).

From the Committee on Military Affairs:
S. 1635. A bill to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 686).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1539. A bill to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 684).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1689. A bill to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets; with an amendment (Rept. No. 685).

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR VAN NUYS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 246, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 246) submitted by Mr. WILLIS on January 27, 1944, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Frederick Van Nuy, late a Senator from the State of Indiana, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST- WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I report from the Committee on Printing Senate Resolution 249, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The resolution provides for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 249) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning of the United States Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 500 additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said special committee, during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 102) creating a special committee on post-war economic policy and planning.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Sterling Hutcheson, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Luther B. Way, deceased;

Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands of the United States;

Norris Metzger Thomas, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice William F. Burguson, deceased; and

Lynn J. Gemmill, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the first division of Alaska, vice William A. Holzheimer, retired.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF ANTHONY J. DIMOND

As in executive session,

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, by direction of the Judiciary Committee I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from that committee the nomination of ANTHONY J. DIMOND, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for the third division of Alaska.

I served for 8 years with ANTHONY J. DIMOND in the House of Representatives while he was serving as Delegate from Alaska. I have not met a man in the entire Congress, Mr. President, who has done a finer job in representing his Territorial district in Congress than has the Delegate from Alaska, and I know that if the Senate confirms his nomination as judge of the third division of Alaska we can expect the same fine record in his judicial capacity as we have seen in his legislative capacity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be received and placed on the executive calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1697. A bill to provide for distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to libraries at military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1698. A bill to carry out obligations of the United States under article 27 of the Geneva Convention relating to compensation for certain injuries to interned workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1699. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, as amended; and

S. 1700. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mercy Duke Boehl; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1702. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in any occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEM- BERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—AMEND- MENTS

Mr. FERGUSON submitted two amendments, and Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BALL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BUCK, Mr.

EASTLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. SMITH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed to the amendment of Mr. BARKLEY to House amendment numbered 3 to the bill (S. 1235) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MANUAL EXPLANATORY OF THE PRIVI- LEGES, RIGHTS, AND BENEFITS OF AND FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. BONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 251), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for All Persons Who Are or Have Been Members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and of Those Dependent Upon Them" be printed as a Senate document; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

INQUIRY INTO LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 252), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey any or all Executive orders of the President, and directives, rules, and regulations issued by or under authority of any department or independent agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, with particular regard to the source of constitutional or legislative authority upon which such Executive orders, directives, rules, and regulations are based, their validity, and the effect and manner of their enforcement, and to report to the Senate before the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress the results of such study and survey, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems justified.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary; that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia; that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BELBO] be excused from further service as chairman of the Committee on Pensions, and that he be appointed chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia; that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] be appointed chairman of the Committee on Pensions; and that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] be assigned to service on the following committees: District of Columbia, Education and Labor. Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Indian Affairs.

TRANSFER OF LOANS FROM HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 248) requesting certain information concerning loans transferred by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to private lending institutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution go over for the time being.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT AMERICA WANTS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished Vice President of the United States at Los Angeles on Friday of last week and broadcast over N. B. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this trip to the west coast I propose to talk about America tomorrow. Today I shall speak about what America wants. Later on at San Francisco and Seattle I shall discuss what America can have and how America can get it. We want many different things and some of these are in conflict with others. But let me point out right at the start that the sum total of what we Americans can have is immense. Only a few years ago, when the President said we wanted 50,000 warplanes a year, some people thought he was being visionary. Today we know that the production of a hundred thousand warplanes a year is a hard reality. So I tell you we can have twice as much for civilian living after the war as we ever had before the war, and you know that is no dream. There are limits but they are much higher than most people even yet realize.

But we cannot have all these things unless we use good sense and good management. If we try to grab too much all we shall get is another boom and another collapse. That is why I want us to think clearly about what each of us wants, and then about how our desires can be made to fit into a practical total, and finally how to get that total. This is the practical way of planning, creating, and enjoying the common welfare.

The first and most important need has to do with the desires of plain folks who have to work for a living in the factories and the stores, in the schoolhouses and the Government offices. More than 50,000,000 of these people with their wives and children have just one basic interest in life, the assurance of a steady job. They would like the assurance of an annual salary or, at any rate, the guarantee of 2,000 hours of work a year.

Of course labor wants more than a job, wants more than decent wages; it wants to be appreciated, to feel that it is contributing toward making this world a better place in which to live.

The workers of the United States want assurance that they can have jobs when the 7,000,000 servicemen and the 10,000,000 war workers who by their supreme efforts are saving us during this mighty conflict, find it necessary to get back into peacetime work. They want a plan that will solve the problem when there are more workers than jobs. Nowhere is this situation so acute as right here on the west coast. When men begin to hunt for jobs the bargaining power of labor begins to weaken and union funds begin to melt away. Workers everywhere know this and therefore are beginning to think in larger terms than merely bargaining for higher wages, shorter hours and better working conditions. They want to have a part in making those decisions which will determine the future prosperity of the Nation. They want to influence Government and industry to bring about full use of manpower, full use of resources and full use of technological know-how.

With the United States producing in peace as it has been producing in war, the workers know that they can have opportunities for leisure and culture, and above everything else possibilities for the real education of their children.

Workers want better insurance against sickness, unemployment, and old age. They want the Wagner Act, not as a substitute for full employment, but as an insurance against the accidents to which all of us are subject. When post-war contracts are canceled American labor wants work, not a dole. The Wagner Act can never be a substitute for jobs, but combined with jobs it is admirable.

Organized labor has come of age. It has taken its place as a responsible partner of management in the operation of industry and trade. It has accepted responsibility in war for maintaining an increase in production. It has the right to ask for fair and honest treatment from the public.

As a responsible partner, labor wants an opportunity to make creative contributions to industry and to benefit therefrom. During the war, hundreds of thousands of workers have submitted ideas for increasing efficiency, enlarging output, saving time and costs, and improving the quality of the product. Labor during the war has enjoyed co-operating with management in doing a real production job and we must never again let such a rich source of national wealth go untapped.

The farmer has more wants than the worker because he himself is not only a worker but also a manager, a capitalist, a trader, and a debtor. The farmer is exposed both to weather and markets beyond his control. A farmer's first desire, therefore, is to remove the extraordinary hazards of his business. His first want is the assurance of decent markets, low freight rates, and reasonable marketing costs. The farmers want low interest rates, a chance to buy farm machinery and fertilizer at low prices. As a purchaser, the farmer knows that he has long been victimized by monopolies both when he sells and when he buys. Farmers want good roads, good schools, and rural electrification at low cost. Farmers love the soil and want

to be able to handle it so as to leave it to their children better than they found it. Above all farmers want to produce abundantly, to see the fruits of their labor raise the living standards of mankind.

In recent years farmers have become more and more interested in getting legislation which would give them bargaining power equivalent to that enjoyed by labor and industry. Thousands of farmers have become skilled Washington lobbyists. Having learned the Washington lobby game, they intend to use Federal power to hold up farm prices after the war. Some false farm leaders use the farm lobbying power to help business against labor, just like some false union leaders use their lobbying power to help business against the consumer. But the best farm leaders realize that farm prices can be maintained in the post-war period only if labor is fully employed at high wages, just like the best labor leaders realize that good wages and full employment cannot be long enjoyed unless the farmers are prosperous. All farmers, like all workers, want stability and a rising standard of living.

Some, but not all, big businessmen want that type of control which will produce big profits. They want to put Wall Street first and the Nation second. They want to put property rights first and human rights second. They will fight with unrelenting hatred through press, radio, demagog, and lobbyist every National and State government which puts human rights above property rights.

To its own conscience this selfish, narrow-visioned branch of big business puts its desires in mild-sounding phrases somewhat as follows: "We must have an economically sound Government and a balanced Budget. Government spending must be cut down. We must get rid of that 'so and so' in the White House. Then with government out of business and with Wall Street running the country again, we can have what we want—free enterprise. Yes, the free enterprise of old-fashioned America is what we really want."

By free enterprise this type of big business means freedom for freebooters. By free enterprise this type of big business means the privilege of charging monopoly prices without interference by the Government; the privilege of putting competitors out of business by unfair methods of competition; the privilege of buying up patents and keeping them out of use; the privilege of setting up Pittsburgh plus price-fixing schemes; the privilege of unloading stocks and bonds on the public through insiders who know their way in and out, up and down, backward and sideways.

Fortunately, not all big businessmen ask for these privileges or define free enterprise in the way I have just mentioned. Some of them are as deeply concerned with the problem of full employment as labor itself. They are anxious to see such modification in taxation laws as will place the maximum incentive on that type of business activity which will give full employment. Some of these larger businessmen have marvelous new inventions which they would like to put into volume production at the earliest possible moment. Such men are oftentimes more interested in increasing production, and thereby serving humanity, than in making money for money's sake, but they know that even from the standpoint of serving humanity, it is necessary to make a reasonable profit if this private enterprise economy of ours is to survive. Therefore they want the assurance of large and expanding markets.

The small businessman is just as much interested in free enterprise as the big businessman but he means something quite different in his use of the word. Free enterprise to the little businessman means the opportunity to compete without fear of monopoly controls of any kind. The small manufacturer wants free access to markets and the assurance

that he will not suddenly find himself crushed by some hostile financial power.

The small businessman in his way is just as much a typical American as the small farmer. Some of his relatives may be workers, some may be farmers or one of them may actually be a big businessman. The small businessman is the source of a large part of the initiative of the United States. The small businessman is humble, ambitious, confused, and uncertain. He is not very happy because, in war and in peace, the rate of economic casualties among small businesses is so high.

Moreover, the small businessman is not sure that the situation will be any better for him when peace comes than it is right now. The small businessman wants a fair chance to compete in a growing market with fair access to raw materials, capital, and technical research. These desires are not unreasonable but they will require some protection by the Government.

Some of the businessmen who most want to serve the world in the post-war period are probably those who have rather recently graduated from the ranks of the small businessmen into handling large affairs in the war effort. Because of his unusual capacity, this kind of man has made large sums of money during the war, but has paid nearly all of his profits to the Government. He will come out of the war with large plant facilities. He wants to know how to reconvert as fast as possible. His success has often depended largely upon his fine relationship with labor. Appreciating the loyalty of labor, he wants to give his workers jobs in the post-war period, not so much from the standpoint of making money as from the standpoint of doing things both for his workers and for the country. Such men are in some ways the hope of America and of the world. I hope the post-war slump will not be so big when it finally comes as to make it possible for the large static corporations with huge cash reserves to take over the establishments which these energetic men have built so skillfully with the cooperation of loyal labor. Big businessmen must not have such control of Congress and the executive branch of government as to make it easy for them to write the rules of the post-war game in a way which will shut out the men who have made such a magnificent contribution to the productive power of America during the war. We need them to furnish the jobs which are so important both to labor and to agriculture. Henry Kaiser, who sees this problem clearly, has recently suggested an interesting way to finance medium-sized business firms.

The big three—big business, big labor, and big agriculture—if they struggle to grab Federal power for monopolistic purposes are certain to come into serious conflict unless they recognize the superior claims of the general welfare of the common man. Such recognition of the general welfare must be genuine, must be more than polite mouthing of high-sounding phrases. Each of the big three has unprecedented power at the present time. Each is faced with serious post-war worries. Each will be tempted to try to profit at the expense of the other two when the post-war boom breaks. Each can save itself only if it learns to work with the other two and with government in terms of the general welfare. To work together without slipping into an American fascism will be the central problem of post-war democracy.

Let us consider for a moment what the far West wants. It is prodigiously rich in natural resources which promise a greater future development for this region than for any other in the country. To accomplish this development expeditiously, the West will require investment capital, additional transportation facilities, and more workers. It will require lower and nondiscriminatory freight rates and access to technologies. It will need

development of its hydropower resources and great increases in irrigation to take care of the food requirements of a growing West and a wealthier country generally. The West looks forward to a future in which the trade of the Pacific will rival that of the Atlantic. The West wants and is entitled to more influence in Washington, D. C.

Looking to the broader interests of the Nation, it is apparent that what is wanted is a balanced development of all the economic resources of all regions, that whatever raises the economic level of one region creates new markets for other regions.

As citizens of a great democracy, the most urgent want is to be accurately and intelligently informed on all the issues which confront us. There must cease to be secrecy in public affairs, except where military necessity requires. In a democracy public officials must trust the people. The greatest responsibility, however, rests on the press and the other agencies of public information, a responsibility which the workers who gather and prepare the news will enjoy discharging if they are given the opportunity. The press, the radio, and the other agencies of public information must take the lead and carry the major responsibility for our greatest assignment in mass education—the education of our people for political and economic democracy.

As citizens of a democracy, we must all be vitally concerned with the adequacy of the education available. Many adults want opportunities to complete their educations, to prepare for better jobs, or to develop new interests. The training of our citizen army has demonstrated the potentialities of adult education to millions; when demobilized, they will demand comparable opportunities in peace.

The wants of the returning servicemen mean more to us right now than the wants of anyone else. In this year 1944 a grateful nation is determined not to let the servicemen down. These men are entitled to job priorities and mustering-out pay. They will want the same things as workers and farmers but they will want more. During the war millions of them have learned to walk with death, pain, and severe physical hardship. They have learned to love their country with a fierce patriotism. They forgot about money. Big profits, higher wages, and higher prices for farm products meant nothing to them. Therefore, they learned to hate pressure-group warfare. They may return to private life and become a pressure group for the general welfare. Their disgust with pressure-group politics wrongly channeled could lead to a new kind of fascism, but rightly directed it may result in a true general-welfare democracy for the first time in history. These young men will run the country 15 years hence.

As citizens we want competent and honest government all the way from the local community to Washington. We want a government that uses its powers openly, intelligently, and courageously to preserve equality of opportunity, freedom of enterprise, and the maximum of initiative for all the people. We want a government which will recognize those things which it can best provide in the interests of all—security of persons and property; freedom of religion, of speech, and of thought; education; public health; social insurance; minimum labor standards; and fair standards of competition—and then effectively discharge its responsibilities.

As consumers, our wants merge into the general welfare. Our dominant want is for an efficiently functioning economy—full employment of labor, capital, and technologies; a balanced development of all regions; the preservation of genuine free enterprise and competition to assure progress and a rising standard of living; the avoidance of business ups and downs; and no exploitation of labor, capital, or agriculture.

We all want jobs, health, security, freedom, business opportunity, good education, and peace. We can sum this all up in one word and say that what America wants is pursuit of happiness. Each individual American before he dies wants to express all that is in him. He wants to work hard. He wants to play hard. He wants the pleasures of a good home with education for his children. He wants to travel and on occasion to rest and enjoy the finer things of life. The common man thinks he is entitled to the opportunity of earning these things. He wants all the physical resources of the Nation transformed by human energy and human knowledge into the good things of life, the sum total of which spells peace and happiness. He knows he cannot have such peace and happiness if the means of earning peace and happiness are denied to any man on the basis of race or creed.

The common man means to get what he is entitled to. Any failure to utilize our resources to the full will cause him to throw over any system which he thinks stands in his way. The impulse of humanity toward full use and full expression is now so intense as to be identical with life itself. We who love democracy must make it politically and economically a capable servant of the irresistible instincts of man and nature toward full use.

All of us want to be needed and appreciated. We want to feel that the world would be a poorer place if we died. We want to enjoy the world, contribute to the world and be appreciated by the world each in his own little way.

The bitterness of the depression was that so many millions were cut off by unemployment. That is the bitterness we do not want to see again, when the war is over and the boys come home. We want reasonably full employment so that every American can feel himself a member of his country.

We have the materials to work with. We have the science and technical skills to direct our work. We have innumerable desires for goods and services that we are able to supply. All we need is good management and harmony, less grabbing for ourselves, and more cooperation for the general welfare. Legitimate self-interest can be realized in no other way. By working together for victory in war we have made a resounding success. By working together for the common good in peace we can get results beyond what most Americans have dared to hope.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND LASTING PEACE— ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Human Rights and Lasting Peace," delivered by Senator KILGORE at the intermission Metropolitan Opera broadcast in New York City on February 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Future," delivered by him on February 2, 1944, before the Wisconsin Retail Hardware Association at Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTING BY SOLDIERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of voting by soldiers, delivered by Senator BREWSTER on February 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

"FARMING—THEN AND NOW"—ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address en-

titled "Farming—Then and Now," delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels before the North Carolina Farm Bureau Federation, at Raleigh, N. C., on February 2, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH LOUIS BROMFIELD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Louis Bromfield, under the heading "Bromfield assails administration, raps Willkie on bond-rally visit," and an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of February 7, 1944, entitled "This Is Starvation Month, or Had You Forgotten It?" which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY G. SEALS AIKEN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by G. Seals Aiken, of Atlanta, Ga., at the convention of the Knights of Pythias, held in Georgia, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ATTITUDE OF RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Moscow Sleigh Ride," published in a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF IRRIGATION PROJECTS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the McCook (Nebr.) Daily Gazette of February 2, 1944, relative to a recent decision of the War Production Board relative to the development of irrigation projects in the Middle West, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with.

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

BILLS, AND SO FORTH, PASSED OVER

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 403) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 675) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 409) authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 670) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 445) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 23) authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 205) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear and render judgment upon claims for damages resulting in the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 875) to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 249) providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi advises me that he withdraws the objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky, the further call of the calendar is dispensed with.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1612) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the pending amendment, proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 40 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and to insert "12 o'clock meridian on the date of the holding of the election."

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Connecticut that he is informed that the Senator from Connecticut has already spoken once on the amendment. Does the Senator from Connecticut desire to speak on the bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall follow that course, Mr. President.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There are three amendments which I should like to ask unanimous consent to have adopted. The first is the one proposed by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], which provides that there be written into the war ballot a provision respecting "United States Senator, unexpired term." Printed copies of the amendment have been distributed and Senators have them on their desks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the amendment had better come up in its regular course, and be offered in the regular way. I do not think we can give unanimous consent to the consideration of these amendments, so I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the next amendment I propose is on page 31, in the second line of the caption beginning

"Oath of elector", to strike out the figures "1944" and substitute therefor "19--." The amendment represents the correction of a clerical error.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will not object to that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. And on the same page in the acknowledgment to the "Oath of elector" I propose to strike out the figures "194--" and substitute therefor "19--."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. I offer a third amendment. On page 42, in line 3, I suggest after the words "post cards" that there be inserted the words "(or post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment)." I shall state the purpose of the amendment. The form of post card mentioned in the pending amendment is different from the form of post card under the existing law. Already there have been 10,000,000 or more post cards made available for distribution under the existing law, and some of them will have been distributed before the amendment, if adopted, goes into effect. So the proposed amendment makes it possible for either post card to be used in this connection. In other words, we do not want to have to recall 10,000,000 post cards and substitute 10,000,000 similar but not identical post cards in their place. The language of the amendment is similar to the language to be found in lines 4 and 5 on page 43 in section 202.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there ought to be some further consideration of that amendment, and I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of objection to two amendments offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I suggest to him that they can be offered in their regular order.

Mr. GREEN. Yes, Mr. President. I offered them at this time because I thought there would be no objection to them.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it is my purpose to modify my amendment pending before the Senate, in the following respect: On page 40, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and in lieu of the remainder of the amendment as printed, insert the following: "The hour for the closing of the polls on the date of the holding of the election."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I think all of us have discovered in the interchange of ideas with reference to the language of the bill itself that our own experience with and knowledge of local conditions, local laws, and local practices have been of assistance to us

in our attempted understanding of the difficulties to be overcome in this whole situation. We have found that in many particulars, corrections were required and modifications necessary. There remain yet other items in connection with the technical side of the bill as to which amendments are required. It is my hope that whatever action is ultimately to be taken with reference to the entire business before the Senate, we can proceed to the completion of the bill in the needed particulars. Many amendments of a technical nature have been adopted in the last few days; they are and will be of great importance in the administration of the bill, should it become law.

For example, Mr. President, I have in mind a further amendment on page 31. We find there a form of oath. The attestation to the oath is this:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ----- day of -----, 194--.

Followed by the line for signature, and rank or grade.

It is my purpose, Mr. President, to offer an amendment. In lieu of the language just read I propose to insert the following:

Personally appeared before me the above-named voter to me known and known to me to be the person who after being duly sworn subscribed the foregoing oath.

In witness whereof I have set my hand this ----- day of -----, 19--.

(Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant or its equivalent, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath.)

I offer that amendment and ask that it be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Senator from Connecticut whether it is his desire to modify his pending amendment, or does the amendment to which he has just addressed himself relate to something else?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, this is a new amendment. I understood the Chair earlier to rule that, without objection, the previous amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the Chair's opinion the first amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. I understood the Chair to state that, as modified, it was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator has a right to modify his own amendment without consent, and after he did so, then the Chair announced that without objection, the amendment was agreed to. I do not know whether the Chair intended his announcement to apply to the original amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to modify his own amendment if he desires, and it does not require unanimous consent or agreement.

Mr. DANAHER. The amendment I am now speaking to is a further amendment, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amend-

ment of the Senator from Connecticut on page 40, line 1, as modified, is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Now I move the adoption of the amendment I just stated, which is on page 31 to strike out:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ----- day of -----, 194--.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

Personally appeared before me the above-named voter to me known and known to me to be the person who after being duly sworn subscribed the foregoing oath.

In witness whereof I have set my hand this ----- day of -----, 19--.

And then the line for signature and the language below the signature as it appears in the measure before us.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the House amendments to Senate bill 1285 be laid before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Does not the Senator from Connecticut have the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has made a motion which is a privileged motion.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Louisiana make such a motion in the time of the Senator from Connecticut? The Senator from Connecticut has not yielded the floor. I submit in view of that situation—

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Connecticut had yielded the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the Chair had recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the situation to be that an amendment has been offered by the Senator from Connecticut, which is a debatable amendment. The Chair understands that having offered the amendment, the matter then was open to discussion, and recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana has disclosed that he did not seek recognition to discuss the amendment, but to make a motion, which he has a right to make if he is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has been recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whether the Senator from Connecticut had finished his comments on his own amendment and had yielded the floor I do not know. It is probably a question of intention on the part of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. OVERTON. I understood the Senator from Connecticut had yielded the floor. In fact, the Chair was submitting the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut for a vote to the Senate, and asked that the Senate vote upon it. Thereupon I asked for recognition, and the Chair recognized me, and I made the preferential motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Connecticut was a modification of his own amendment, which did not require the concurrence of the Senate. Then the Senator from Connecticut offered another amendment which did require the concurrence of the Senate. After the Senator from Connecticut offered his amendment the Chair thought he understood the Senator from Connecticut to indicate that he did not wish to continue the discussion; and the Chair thereupon recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Connecticut offered a modification to his amendment which was pending when we recessed on Saturday. Then, after he had modified his own amendment, as he had a right to do, the Chair said, "Without objection, the amendment is agreed to." I understood that that ruling by the Chair applied to the pending amendment which the Senator from Connecticut himself had modified.

Thereupon the Senator from Connecticut offered another amendment which had no connection whatever with the amendment which had been pending and which was modified. Which one of the amendments is pending before the Senate, Mr. President?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces it is the second amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The first amendment was agreed to; was it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment was agreed to. But it was the understanding of the Chair that the second amendment, which required the concurrence of the Senate, was submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well; that clears up the matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the further understanding of the Chair that, the Senator from Connecticut having submitted the amendment, if he desired to retain the floor it would have been necessary for him to have indicated that he desired to retain the floor and to have gotten recognition to that end, which the Chair did not understand the Senator from Connecticut desired to do. And the Chair, not understanding that the Senator from Connecticut desired further recognition, inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana then addressed the Chair, the Chair recognized the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Barkley	Burton
Austin	Billbo	Ball
Bailey	Brooks	Brewster
Bankhead	Duck	Bushfield

XC—C1

Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capper	Kilgore	Shipstead
Caraway	La Follette	Smith
Chandler	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	Maloney	Tobey
Davis	Maybank	Truman
Downey	Mead	Tunnell
Eastland	Millikin	Tydings
Ellender	Moore	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Murdock	Wagner
George	Murray	Wallgren
Gerry	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Green	O'Daniel	Walsh, N. J.
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Gurney	Overton	Wherry
Hatch	Pepper	White
Hawkes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hayden	Reed	Willis
Hill	Revercomb	Wilson
Holman	Reynolds	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the motion now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1285. The motion is not debatable, and the question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. OVERTON. On that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and will vote. I vote "nay." The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a conference at the White House. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Iowa.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. His general pair and the transfer thereof have been announced.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present the Senator from California would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bailey	Ellender	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gerry	Reynolds
Billbo	Gurney	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Smith
Bushfield	McClellan	Taft
Butler	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Millikin	Wheeler
Capper	Moore	Wherry
Caraway	Nye	White
Connally	O'Daniel	Willis
Eastland	Overton	Wilson

NAYS—44

Alken	Hayden	Radcliffe
Austin	Jackson	Stewart
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	La Follette	Tobey
Chavez	Langer	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tydings
Danaher	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Mead	Wallgren
Ferguson	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Green	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hatch	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Gillette	McCarran
Bone	Glass	McNary
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham

So Mr. OVERTON's motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that the pending question be put.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the motion just voted upon was not debatable. Therefore, I have had to wait until now to make a statement, which I proceed to do briefly.

The thing which I am anxious to have is expedition in consideration of this bill. I think the country expects it. It seems to me that the only possible thing that could happen as the result of now laying before the Senate the House amendments to Senate bill 1285 would be to invite the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to offer the Green-Lucas bill as an amendment to one of the House amendments. We should then be back where we started, except that we should have lost our limitation upon debate in respect to amendments to the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. President, I think that would be of no advantage to anyone, and certainly not to the viewpoint which I hold fundamentally, namely, that we should get on with this business. So I state for the information of the Senate that as soon as the Green-Lucas bill is perfected and the amendments necessary to it are agreed to I shall, of course, vote at that time to take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite follow the logic of the argument. If the only way by which we are to make any progress in this matter is to take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, obviously the sooner we take up the House amendments the quicker we will get through.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not think that is at all obvious. I think that consideration of the amendments to the Green-Lucas bill should proceed under the limitation of debate. There will be no limitation of debate after we shall have taken up the House amendments.

Mr. TAFT. However, when the House amendments are taken up, if the administration offers the Green-Lucas bill as an amendment to one of the House amendments, the Green-Lucas bill would be subject to unlimited debate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is not the slightest doubt in the world about that.

Mr. TAFT. I very much hope that the question will be disposed of at once. My only reason for voting for the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Overton] was that it seems to me that if that is the way we are to reach a final agreement with the House, obviously the quickest way to do it is to do it at once and not continue debate on a bill which will pass the Senate and then die.

So far as I can see the House will not take up the second bill which we pass. I do not care, but it seems to me that all the debate from now on until we pass the Green-Lucas bill will be time thrown away because after that we will go back to Senate bill 1285, and the debate on Senate bill 1285 will be exactly the same, regardless of whether we shall have already passed the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Apparently I am unable to make my position plain to the Senator from Ohio, but it seems perfectly plain to me that the obvious orderly procedure is to perfect the Green-Lucas bill before we draw the final issue between the Green-Lucas bill and the House amendments to Senate bill 1285. If we can perfect the Green-Lucas bill under the limitation of debate it seems to me that we can save time; and that is the only thing in the world in which I am interested in connection with the procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will, I presume, agree that to go forward with a bill which the Senator contemplates will very shortly be offered as an amendment to another bill, presents an anomalous situation. Is it not possible that the amendments which might be adopted in perfecting the Green-Lucas bill might have to be reconsidered in the light of the bill which the Senate earlier passed, and which the House has since amended? We would then be proceeding only under the phase of amending the House amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator can theoretically make the point which he makes. However, in my judg-

ment, as a practical matter we have reached the point where the only thing remaining to do with the Green-Lucas bill is to perfect some of its noncontroversial details. I respectfully submit that the orderly procedure calls for completion of the process of perfecting the Green-Lucas bill. A motion can then be made to proceed with the consideration of the House amendments, and I shall vote for such a motion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator contemplate little difficulty in infiltrating the Green-Lucas bill into the House amendments?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I contemplate nothing but difficulty in respect to the parliamentary presentation. I underwrite no share of it, and I have nothing to do with the management of it. At the moment I am merely explaining that I am trying to vote in a way which I think will facilitate the present procedure; and God knows that if we can facilitate it for even 20 minutes the country will be much obliged.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Michigan, perhaps I should make this observation:

I agree with him up to a certain point, namely, that in my judgment we ought to perfect the bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate and dispose of it. We have no way of knowing what the House will do. We cannot predict. The House has its own responsibility. After this bill is disposed of we will all be in favor of taking up the House amendments and disposing of them in whatever fashion the Senate wishes to dispose of them. If the House amendments should be agreed to I, of course, would not want to predict what the fate of the legislation would be. I do not intimate what its fate would be, but we shall at least have sent to the House, in the form of Senate bill 1612, our most recent expression upon the subject. If after the House amendments are taken up the Green-Lucas bill as then perfected should be adopted in lieu of any of the House amendments, that would throw the bill into conference, and if the conferees were able to work out a fairly satisfactory bill, of course Senate bill 1612 would not be further considered. There would be no necessity for considering it. So I think the logical and orderly way to proceed is to complete consideration of the Green-Lucas bill, Senate bill 1612, and let the Senate pass upon it. If it should be passed it then would go on its way to the House. We could take up the House amendments to the other bill, and if they should go to conference, of course that would offer the most direct method by which some agreement could be arrived at for legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that after the passage of the Green-Lucas bill, or its defeat, the Senator proposes to take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285?

Mr. BARKLEY. Frankly, that is my purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have taken very little part in this debate, but I have been impressed with the desire of both sides of the controversy to see that the soldier shall be given an opportunity to vote. That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not know who is at fault for the anomalous position in which we find ourselves, but I do know that the sooner we pass a bill the better it will be for the country. It seems to me that unless we can pass the Lucas-Green bill soon, we had better do something else.

Up to the present moment I have been voting against taking up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, but personally I am becoming tired of waiting and hearing debate about how much we love the soldier and how much we want him to vote, and having nothing done about it. Unless the Green-Lucas bill shall be passed by the Senate pretty soon I shall move to take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am sorry, but I fail to follow the Senator's argument. Apparently any bill would be better than no bill. Does not the Senator understand that we have already on the statute books a soldiers' voting law? What is the use of passing a bill unless it be an improvement over the existing law, unless the soldier is to have a better chance of voting, or unless more soldiers are to vote? If a bill is proposed which would reduce the number of soldiers who will vote, or make it harder to vote on the part of those who can vote, why pass any bill at all?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will answer the Senator. It is because I want some kind of a bill, that I shall vote for the Lucas-Green bill. The bill is not what I desire, or what the soldiers from New Mexico desire, but it is better that they receive something than nothing at all. Under the Lucas-Green bill the soldier from New Mexico would be able to vote for only the President and Members of Congress. The soldier from New Mexico would like to vote for local officials, but that would be impossible under the State law and constitution. So when I vote for the Green-Lucas bill I shall be voting for some kind of a bill in preference to no bill at all.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am afraid that I failed to make my point clear. We now have a soldier vote law. It has proved inadequate. The Green-Lucas bill is intended to make it more adequate. The bill provides for an improvement over existing law, more soldiers could vote under it. Under the House amendments to Senate bill 1285 not so many soldiers could vote, and those who could vote would find it more difficult. Under the Green-Lucas bill we would not have the Federal ballot alone, but a Federal ballot and a State ballot. Under the House amendments we would have only a State ballot.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not impressed by the statement that the pending bill is the best one. The proponents of the Green-Lucas bill think theirs is the best bill.

After all, we must pass judgment on it, and let our conscience be our guide. I shall vote for the Green-Lucas bill because it will afford the only chance the boys in the Pacific or in Italy or at Attu or elsewhere will have to vote. That is the only reason I shall vote for it. It will afford them an opportunity to have some kind of a vote. I do not know which is the best bill, but I am satisfied in my own mind that the Scott Lucas bill will allow the boys from New Mexico to vote at least for someone. That is the reason I am for it.

Mr. GREEN. As I have been completely eliminated I will resume my seat. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I meant the "Green-Lucas" bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to propose several amendments to Senate bill 1612. On page 29 I move to strike the words "Or write in the name of his political party."

Those words appear in the form of the official Federal war ballot as printed on page 29, but they are not indicated by lines in the printed copy of the bill. The words I move to strike out follow the language:

Official Federal war ballot.

Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

At the session of the Senate on Friday last the words "Democratic, Republican, Progressive, or other" were stricken from the bill.

I am of the opinion that we would have a much better bill if we would allow the voters to vote by name rather than by party, and, as I have already stated on the floor, we have a method of getting the names to the soldiers and the party's on literature which is to go to the soldiers. I therefore propose now to strike out the words "or write in the name of his political party."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I presume the Senator wants to make the same amendment applicable elsewhere in the form of the ballot.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I presume I shall have to offer the amendments separately. I now move another amendment on page 29. As I have said, the lines are not numbered, so I will have to designate the place by saying that the words I propose to strike out follow the words "write in the name of your choice for President." Following those words, I move to strike out the words "or the name of his party." I understand I will have to move the amendment separately.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. The next amendment I offer is to strike out the words "or the name of his party" after the word "Senator," where it appears in the line "write in the name of your choice for Senator."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now move to strike out the words "or the name of his party" following the words on page 29, "Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now move to strike out the words "or name of his party" after the words "write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 30 I move to strike out in lines 1 and 2 the words "A vote by party designation shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidate of that party by name."

Mr. McKELLAR. I inquire where that amendment comes in.

Mr. FERGUSON. In lines 1 and 2, page 30.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to say a very brief word about the parliamentary confusion that confronts the Senate. In a somewhat long congressional service it is to me one of the most extraordinary situations that has come before either the other House or this body.

In a very large degree I associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I think a great obligation at this time is to get on with the business before the Senate and bring to some definite conclusion the matured judgment of the Senate on the pending matter.

Mr. President, I have twice voted for motions to lay the House amendments before the Senate. I have done so in large part because I have believed that whether or not we proceeded to vote upon the Green-Lucas bill, we would ultimately find, if the House amendments were laid before the Senate, that the Green-Lucas bill or its substance would be offered as an amendment to one of the House amendments to this House bill. It seems to be if that course were followed and if the Green-Lucas bill were

offered as an amendment to one of the House amendments and was agreed to, then we would have something which could go to conference between the two Houses, with some ultimate hope that a decision would be reached.

I have felt and feel now that if we proceed to the perfection of the Green-Lucas bill by amendment, and vote affirmatively upon its passage it will result in confusion worse confounded. We would have pending here the original Senate bill amended by the House, with no action by the Senate upon the House amendments, and we would have for a second time sent a bill of the Senate upon the same matter to the House. I can see nothing but complete confusion, nothing but a complete break-down of the legislative process as between the two Houses if such a course should be followed.

I have said I voted twice to lay the House amendments before the Senate. I so voted without intending to indicate in any way my ultimate attitude toward the pending legislation. I have done it because I thought—I am not certain that I am right about it—but I have done it because I have thought that the adoption of such a motion and the laying of the House amendments before this body with the right to amend them, would facilitate the final disposition of this matter. I still believe that is the correct way to proceed.

I have to confess that it never had occurred to me that we would vote upon the pending Green-Lucas bill as a Senate bill and that then we would give separate and distinct consideration to the original Green-Lucas bill as amended by the House. But whatever course we pursue, Mr. President, I think we should follow it with celerity and bring this matter to some final disposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay consideration of the bill, and I have not contributed remotely to any delay. I merely wish to observe that in my opinion the American people are not very much interested in parliamentary technicalities. I also believe that the American soldier, sailor, or marine, or member of any other branch of our armed services, is not interested in parliamentary technicalities. What those men desire, and I hope what we all desire, is that we can come to an agreement, in the quickest and promptest and best way possible, on a workable Federal ballot law. I think a majority of the Senate feels that way about it, and I hope I may be pardoned if I say that I think that ultimately a majority of the other body will feel the same way. However, I do not wish to make any prediction. I am merely giving my opinion after conferences and talks, and on the basis of information I have received.

If we shall pass the Green-Lucas bill, and then take up the House amendments, as we shall do promptly—although there will be no limitation of debate upon the House amendments, and cannot be unless a subsequent agreement to that effect shall be made, and, of course, that would have to be by unanimous consent—it seems to me that, so far as the

Senate is concerned, we will have discharged our obligation and will have resolved the parliamentary technicalities in behalf of the American soldier and his right to vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall conclude in a moment.

I appeal to both sides of the Senate to join in getting on with the business before us so that out of one or the other of the measures we may be able to enact legislation which will make it possible for the members of the armed services to do what the overwhelming majority of the American people want them to have a right to do; that is, cast their votes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, supplementing what the Senator from Kentucky has said, it seems to me that there is really no parliamentary technicality involved in the proposition before the Senate. All the courses suggested would be in consonance with the well-recognized practice of each House, and the practice between the Houses of Congress. There is really no parliamentary question involved. The only question is one as to votes. The question is what a majority of the Senate and a majority of the other House can finally agree upon, and the sooner we cease talking and get a vote, the sooner the matter will be resolved.

I recall that at one time former Speaker Cannon said that if he were given a majority of the House at his back he could pass a cow through the House if he desired to do so. The only question to be determined is the question of the wishes of a majority of this body, and it seems to me that all this debate is beside the point and that the sooner we begin to vote the sooner the whole matter will be determined.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make one further suggestion to the Senator from Rhode Island, if I may have his attention. I ask him to look at page 42, where again we find the language referring to the post cards which are to be distributed with respect to State ballots. I call his attention to the language in lines 5 and 6.

Mr. LUCAS. On what page?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 42. I refer to the phrase "where State procedures can be effectively employed."

It seems to me as though, if that language were adopted, we would be delegating to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy the power to decide whether in their judgment State procedures could be effectively employed, whereas I am sure all the Senator from Rhode Island wants to do is to limit this authority by the words in line 2, "wherever practicable and compatible."

I suggest that the language "where State procedures can be effectively employed" should be eliminated. I do not believe we want to give these two departments the power to decide for themselves whether the State procedures can be effectively employed, beyond the limitation in line 2, which requires them to do this only "when practicable and compatible with military operations."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Michigan, I think I agree with his point of view, but in the past couple of days we have read in the newspapers how information about local elections is being given already to the armed forces, that is, as to the early primaries in certain States, and how the members of the armed forces could apply for applications for ballots or for ballots themselves. However, the officials drew attention to the fact that it would be undesirable for members of the armed forces to apply for applications for ballots or for ballots where there was not sufficient time for the communications to go back and forth, because the air mail, which is limited, would be used to no avail. If there were not time within which to get the application over to the secretary of state of the State and the answer to be returned and the ballot to be cast, the soldier would better not apply at all, because there are certain mailings which load up the limited air-mail carriage. I think the words "where State procedures can be effectively employed" would cover that very point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The trouble is, if I may make a suggestion to the Senator, that the Secretary of War started out by saying that State procedures never can be effectively employed. I dislike to leave the State ballot at the mercy of the decision of a Secretary whose primary conviction is that State procedures cannot be given effect.

Mr. GREEN. I did not wish to oppose the proposal of the Senator from Michigan; I merely desired to draw his attention to the reason for the words being in the bill. I shall not make any objection if the Senator moves to amend by striking the words out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not like to disagree with my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, but from the beginning I have taken the position that every Federal ballot and State ballot should go to every camp in this country and every camp outside this country, unless it were impracticable and incompatible with military operations, just as is suggested here. I do not see any objection, so far as I am personally concerned, to eliminating the words "where State procedures can be effectively employed." It seems to me, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that perhaps the Army and the Navy might have the power, under that language, to make a determination as to whether or not State procedures were sufficient to enable them to administer the law, and I do not care to give them that power, and I do not think any Senator wishes to give them the power; and as a matter of fact, the Army and Navy do not want the power. The Army and Navy have said over and over again that they will attempt to administer any law we pass, and will attempt to do the best job possible with all ballots originating in the States which ultimately find their way overseas, so

long as it is practicable and compatible with military operations. There can be no question about that. So far as I am concerned, I am glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. On page 42, lines 5 and 6, I move to strike out the words "where State procedures can be effectively employed."

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Michigan explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have just completed a long explanation. I do not want the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to have the right to decide for themselves whether they think State procedures are adequate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from section 11, on page 37 of the bill, beginning in line 20:

PRIORITIES

SEC. 11. The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of ballots and communications under this title priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war.

I thought an amendment had been agreed to striking out the "priorities" section so far as it relates to giving Federal ballots priority over State ballots. My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the provision was stricken out, or is still in the bill. If it is still in, the soldier will have the privilege of voting for President or for Presidential electors, and will have the privilege of voting for Senators and Representatives, but his opportunity to vote for State officers will be practically nil.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language covering the priorities was not stricken out in title I, but the section dealing with post cards was rewritten so as to come as closely into harmony with the language of title I as possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is simply a beating around the bush, because section 11 plainly gives the Federal ballots priority over all State ballots, and, of course, we will find that most of the votes will be cast for Federal officers, and that very few will be cast for State officers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At least that question is not involved in the amendment I am submitting.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is not; but I am making inquiry because I want to know concerning the priority situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In reply to the inquiry made by the Senator from Tennessee, the Chair rules that the words in section 11 mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee have not been stricken from the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a War Department release dated February 6, 1944, which deals in marked respect with the subject under inquiry. I send the release to the desk and ask unanimous consent that page 1 and the first paragraph on page 2 be read for the information of the Senate, and that the remainder of the release be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN SOLDIERS OF FOUR STATES WHO DESIRE TO VOTE

Information to facilitate voting in three State primaries and one election during April, by Army personnel whose voting residence is in any one of the four States, is being made available at all military installations, the War Department announced today.

Primary elections will be held during April by the States of Illinois, Nebraska and Pennsylvania. A general election, for State and local offices, will be held in Louisiana. Soldiers are reminded that in applying for primary ballots, they must state their party affiliations in the applications. Applicants for ballots in a general election should not state their party affiliations.

Commanding officers have been instructed by the War Department to call the primaries and the election to the attention of men from the States concerned, in time to give them maximum opportunity to complete all the steps necessary for balloting. In addition, postage-free post-card applications are being made available for all personnel, to be used as indicated in special instructions for each State. In lieu of these post cards it is pointed out that soldiers may write a letter using the text of the post card.

The War Department reminds members of the Army of certain important factors. Under existing laws of these States, a soldier must be at least 21 years old at the election date in order to vote. In certain of these States, voters must take certain steps, in addition to filing application for absentee ballot, in order to be eligible to vote. If a soldier is in doubt as to whether he is a qualified voter under the laws of his State, he should immediately inquire by letter to the secretary of state of the State of his voting residence, as to whether it is necessary to register, pay taxes, or meet other requirements in order to vote.

A soldier, upon receiving his absentee ballot, should execute it and return it immediately. In making application to vote, a soldier outside the continental United States should have in mind the time interval between the date the State will send him the absentee ballot, and the date by which it must be executed and back in the hands of local election officials; also whether the State voting material will travel by air. It is not desirable to burden overseas air mail with applications for ballots in cases where the time interval is manifestly too short to accomplish receipt, execution and return of the ballot.

The remainder of the War Department press release is as follows:

Special information for the four State elections involved follows:

ILLINOIS PRIMARY

The Illinois primary will be April 11. Soldiers having voting residence in that State may apply for ballots ("official war ballots" covering Federal, State, and local offices) by mailing to the secretary of state, Springfield, Ill., the post cards which are available at installations. Soldiers should forward such applications so as to reach Springfield shortly before March 14, the earliest date on which

the State will forward absentee ballots. The ballots, if they are to be counted, must be executed and received by appropriate local election officials in the State by April 11.

NEBRASKA PRIMARY

The Nebraska primary will be April 11. Soldiers having voting residence in that State may apply for ballots (State absentee ballots covering Federal, State, and local offices) by mailing a special application form furnished by Nebraska. The soldier may obtain this special application form in two ways, either by writing a letter to the secretary of state, Lincoln, Nebr. (he may write the letter to appropriate local officials, if known); or by mailing the post card which is available at installations, on which card the soldier should write that he wishes it treated as a request for an application form for State absentee ballot. This request, by either method, should be made at the earliest possible time. The earliest date on which the State will mail out absentee ballots is March 12, and they must be executed and mailed by April 10 at the latest, and must be in the hands of appropriate local election officials by April 13.

PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARY

The Pennsylvania primary will be April 25. Soldiers having voting residence in Pennsylvania may apply for either "official war ballots" (covering only Federal offices), or for State absentee ballots (covering Federal, State, and local offices).

In order to obtain the official war ballots, a soldier should mail the post card available at installations to the secretary of state, Harrisburg, Pa., so as to reach Harrisburg shortly before March 6, the date on which the State will begin forwarding absentee ballots.

If he desires the State absentee ballot, a soldier must fill in and mail a special application form furnished by Pennsylvania. He may request this special application form in one of two ways: either by writing a letter to the secretary of state at Harrisburg, Pa. (he may write the letter to appropriate local officials, if known); or by mailing the post card available at installations, on which card the soldier should write that he wishes it treated as a request for an application form for State absentee ballot. If he wishes the State absentee ballot, he should send for the special application form at the earliest possible time.

When he has obtained the ballot and executed it, he must mail it in time to reach appropriate local officials by April 25 if it is an "official war ballot." If it is a State absentee ballot, it must be mailed by April 25 and received by appropriate local official by May 5.

LOUISIANA ELECTION

The Louisiana election will be April 18. Soldiers having voting residence in Louisiana may apply for State absentee ballots (covering State and local offices) either in accordance with Louisiana law or by mailing to the secretary of state, Baton Rouge, La., the post card available at installations. The State of Louisiana will accept such post cards as applications for State absentee ballots. Applications should be mailed so as to reach Louisiana shortly before March 18, which is the earliest date on which the State will forward absentee ballots. The ballots must be executed and back in the hands of appropriate local officials by April 17.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I inquire what is the pending question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "where State procedures can be effectively employed."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is open to discussion. If there be no discussion of it, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with what has just been read in the press release at the desk, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an amendment which Representative CASE, of South Dakota, offered to Senate bill 1285. The amendment is to be found on page 8 of the bill as passed by the House, beginning in line 7, and I offer the language which I shall now read as an amendment to the pending bill. It is section 2 of the bill as passed by the House, and is as follows:

SEC. 2. To facilitate the distribution of official State ballots to voters who are absent on war duty, it is recommended that the States direct their appropriate county election officials to prepare, not later than 60 days prior to the date of the 1944 general election, a war-duty registration list consisting of all persons eligible to vote who are in the armed forces of the United States, compiling such lists from the records of the selective-service headquarters in each county whose officers are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate in the preparation of such lists.

It is further recommended that applications for absentee ballots be checked against this war-service registration list, and that at the first practical date, not earlier than 60 days before the election, an absentee ballot be mailed to all eligible voters on the wartime registration list from whom an application has not been received. It is suggested that current duty addresses for such voters be obtained from the next-of-kin and such other sources as may be locally available, and that the ballots to overseas addresses be mailed not less than 50 days prior to the date of the general election and that ballots to addresses within the continental United States, be mailed not later than 25 days prior to the date of the general election.

It is further recommended that an application for the ballot and an affidavit of the voter be printed in an abbreviated form at the left side of the face of the return envelope, and that the county election authorities address the return envelope with the appropriate precinct description to insure its prompt delivery to the appropriate election officials when returned.

It is suggested that the application and affidavit by the voter be placed on the outside of the return envelope in order to insure that the application will be in the hands of the election officials prior to their receipt of and counting of the vote. It is suggested that such affidavit might be in the following abbreviated form:

Which, Mr. President, under this proposal is to be printed on the return envelope containing the ballot—

APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT

"I hereby apply for an absentee ballot and the right to cast my vote in the general election of 1944. To the best of my knowledge and belief, I am a legally qualified voter of _____ county, State of _____, and my residence is _____. I hereby certify that my ballot will be marked by myself alone and that this ballot is being marked of my own free will and accord for candidates of my choice without any inducement or promise of reward.

"(Signed)_____
"Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 1944."

It is further suggested that a notice to the election officials be printed in small type below the return address on the right half of the face of the envelope in some such language as this:

"(Notice to election officials: This envelope is not to be opened unless the application at the left is accepted as evidence of the applicant's right to cast a ballot and have it counted. In case that is challenged, this envelope should not be opened, but should be kept carefully until the challenge is settled and appropriate action is decided upon.)"

Mr. President, as a part of my amendment I add the following language to the language of section 2 of the amended bill as passed by the House. Following immediately after what I have just read I wish to add the following:

Provided, That if any State fails to prepare the war duty registration list herein recommended at least 60 days prior to the general election of 1944 or fails to mail the regular State ballots to the persons on such list within the time suggested in this section, that the selective service office in each county of such States shall prepare a war duty registration list from the records in its office of each person in the armed forces whose home is in that county and shall prepare a ballot of candidates for Federal office, as hereinafter provided, and shall mail the same to each person on the war duty registration list at the earliest possible date. In obtaining the current duty address of persons on the list so prepared, county selective service officials shall send a post card with return card to the next of kin as shown on the registrant's questionnaire, asking for the latest service mailing address and shall use that address in mailing the ballots unless evidence is found that a better address is available. Not more than one ballot shall be mailed to any person on the war duty registration list, but the envelope addressed to him shall carry a directive to forward the envelope promptly if the addressee's duty address has changed. A postage free air-mail return envelope shall be included with the ballot on the face of which shall be printed the application for the ballot and the affidavit of the voter as proposed in this section, and the return envelope shall be addressed by the county selective service office for return to the election officials of the precinct of the voter's home precinct if known, and if not known, to the election authorities of the voter's home county. The ballot proposed under this proviso shall carry the names of candidates for the following offices: Presidential electors for each party for which Presidential electors will appear on the official State ballot of the State concerned; candidates for the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. The names of the party of which the candidates are nominees shall be shown. In the event that nominations have not been made by any party which cast 10 percent of the vote in the last general election in that State, a blank line shall accompany the name of that party on which the voter can write in the candidate of his choice or indicate that he wishes to vote for the candidate of that party.

At the bottom of the ballot there shall be printed a brief note of instruction to the voter, advising him of any requirement on the marking of the ballot provided by the law of his State, and further advising him that if the return envelope be not addressed to the election officials in the county of his legal residence that he readdress that envelope in accord with his legal residence as stated in the affidavit on the outside of that return envelope.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment to the pending bill because it will save one entire trip by mail which is

now proposed by the printed postal cards. The ballots will be mailed directly to the individual voter by the county officials who have prepared the war duty registration list. The individual voter will not have to bother with the delay of weeks of time in getting an application home and back again. The application will come back on the outside of the outer ballot. The Army and the Navy will not have to bother with it at all; the Post Office Department will largely handle the thing.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Let me inquire where the amendment is proposed to be inserted?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am glad the Senator has asked the question. I propose that the amendment take the place of section 201, on pages 41, 42, and 43 of the pending bill.

Mr. GREEN. Sections 201 to 203?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; section 201 on pages 41, 42, and 43, down to section 202.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, it is very difficult to follow the reading of the entire amendment. A great part of it, as I understand, is taken up with recommendations and suggestions. Let me inquire what are the provisions of positive law which would be changed by the amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The only change would be that it would do away with one entire mailing of the ballot procedure on which we are working. That is the main difference. It would also do away with burdening the Army and the Navy with the transportation of the ballots, and would place that burden largely on the Post Office Department.

Mr. GREEN. I notice that a number of officials who do not exist in some States are mentioned as having charge of elections—county officials, for instance, who do not exist in my own State.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The only officials mentioned in the amendment are those comprising the selective-service board in each county, and every county in the country has such a board.

Mr. GREEN. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. In my own State and in many other States I think there are no such officials. It seems to me that, for that and other reasons, the amendment is in conflict with certain State laws and with the other features of the bill which have been discussed. It would seem to me that it would be better to have the amendment printed so that it could be studied in detail.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes, Mr. President; I should be glad to have that done, so that the amendment could be studied; because I think it would solve many of our present difficulties.

Mr. GREEN. I should be glad to have that done. I understood that the Senator was asking for questions on it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from South Dakota concluded his remarks?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the amendment offered by the able junior Senator from South Dakota, we would strike out title II in its entirety, and would insert the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to have the Senate know that title II is one of the titles on which the committee has worked for many hours in debating and finally laying down a rule which would be of some advice and assistance to the States. Frankly, Mr. President, I cannot tell what is meant by the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota. It comes rather late in the debate for us to give it serious consideration, it seems to me.

But if my memory serves me correctly, as I think it does, there is one thing which I did recall as the Senator presented the amendment to the Senate, namely, that in each and every county in which there is a selective-service board, those boards would be delegated power by the United States Congress to carry on some kind of county ballot commission for Federal and State ballots.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I tried to follow as carefully as I could the remarks of the able junior Senator from South Dakota; but it seems to me that if we adopt his amendment we will substitute merely recommendations on the part of Congress for the affirmative provisions of title II. As I understand title II, it makes it mandatory on the Federal ballot commission to cooperate with State election officials in handling State ballots, whereas the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota merely consists of numerous recommendations to the State election officials.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator is correct, with one exception I mentioned a moment ago with respect to delegating to certain boards of the counties throughout the country power to carry on what seems to me to be more or less a local ballot commission.

I certainly hope the Senate will not seriously consider the adoption of this amendment at this late hour; because Democrats and Republicans alike who are members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and who have worked on title II of the bill have gone over it carefully in line with the officials of various States, and we have definitely agreed upon the provision in the bill. We even agreed to a short amendment offered a moment ago by the Senator from Michigan, to make it a little more definite. If we now start in to amend title II, I am afraid we shall be here a long time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I understood that the amendment was not to be considered until it was printed and Senators had an opportunity to study it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator offer his amendment for the present consideration of the Senate, or does he submit it to lie on the table?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer it for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no other pending amendment; and when an amendment is offered it becomes the pending question.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer it for the present consideration of the Senate. I was merely trying to comply with the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who wished to have the amendment printed so that it might be studied.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Pepper
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Jackson	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Truman
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, my colleague has fully explained section 2 of the House amendment to Senate bill 1285, and has offered as an amendment to the pending bill that portion of the House amendment.

It seems to me that section 2 of the House amendment would improve the Green-Lucas bill. I am sincere in my belief that everyone in the United States wishes to give every member of our armed forces the opportunity to vote. This amendment would obviate the necessity of the soldier or sailor making applications directly to the county auditor, and would eliminate the hazard of such applications being lost in transit. It would certainly indicate a sincerity of purpose if it were suggested that the several States, through their proper county election officials, comb the list

of men in the armed forces and send them each a ballot directly in time. It would allow the soldier not only to have an opportunity to vote for a few Federal officials, but would also give him an opportunity to vote for county and State officers. So I hope Members of the Senate will give this suggestion of my colleague sincere consideration. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. His general pair and the transfer thereof have been announced.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present the Senator from California would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—34

Ball	Gerry	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Shipstead
Brooks	Hawkes	Smith
Buck	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McClellan	Wheeler
Byrd	McKellar	Wherry
Capper	Moore	White
Caraway	Nye	Willis
Chavez	Overton	Wilson
Connally	Reed	
Davis	Revercomb	

NAYS—49

Alken	Danaher	Hatch
Austin	Downey	Hayden
Barkley	Eastland	Hill
Bilbo	Ellender	Jackson
Bone	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Burton	Gillette	Kilgore
Chandler	Green	La Follette
Clark, Mo.	Guffey	Lucas

McCarran	Pepper	Tunnell
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tydings
Maloney	Reynolds	Wagner
Maybank	Russell	Wallgren
Mead	Stewart	Walsh, Mass.
Millikin	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, N. J.
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Murray	Tobey	
O'Mahoney	Truman	

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	McNary
Bailey	George	O'Daniel
Brewster	Glass	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Vandenberg

So Mr. BUSHFIELD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask consideration for an amendment to Senate bill 1612, submitted by myself and my colleague [Mr. JACKSON]. I ask that the clerk state the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana on behalf of himself and his colleague.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, in the official war ballot between the provisions relating to United States Senator and those relating to Representatives in Congress, it is proposed to insert:

UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM
(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator or the name of his party-----

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, before explaining the amendment, in order to clear it in the minds of Senators, I will ask to modify the amendment by deleting the words "or the name of his party" at the end of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification will be made.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I think this amendment is self-explanatory. In the State of Indiana there will be elected two Senators at the coming election; one to fill out the unexpired term of the late Senator Frederick Van Nuys, and one for the full term. So it will be necessary to have this provision made in the ballots if the soldiers are to be permitted to vote for both Senators.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield, this amendment is similar to one I proposed earlier in the day and asked unanimous consent to have adopted, but objection was made. It is entirely acceptable.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] for himself and his colleague [Mr. JACKSON].

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 42, in line 3, after the words "post cards", insert the words "(or post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment)."

The amendment is designed to make the language in that place correspond with the language on the opposite page, page 43, line 4, where the same words are used.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the

Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the words "post card" on page 42, line 3, it is proposed to insert "(or post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment)."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I may say in explanation that there are already some 12,000,000 post cards printed and available under the existing law and they are being distributed. Under the Green-Lucas bill, if passed, post cards are also provided, but in slightly different form. The amendment, if adopted, will make it possible for either kind of post card to serve the same purpose.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the difference between the two post cards?

Mr. GREEN. There is a slight difference of form. The post card on page 42 is a little more elaborate than the form in the existing law.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the 1942 post card got everything in it that the post card in the pending bill has?

Mr. GREEN. Is the Senator referring to page 42 or the year 1942?

Mr. OVERTON. To the year 1942. I thought the Senator was referring to the year.

Mr. GREEN. In one place I referred to the year 1942 and in another place to page 42 of the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator's amendment deal with post cards authorized by the act of 1942 or the post cards contemplated by the pending bill?

Mr. GREEN. To the post cards already printed and being circulated.

Mr. OVERTON. Those post cards are authorized by the act of 1942?

Mr. GREEN. They are.

Mr. OVERTON. And the other post cards are post cards provided for by this bill?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. What I want to know is the difference between the 1942 post cards and the present post cards.

Mr. GREEN. If the Senator will refer to line 4 on page 43, he will find the same language is used. We want to make the two provisions consistent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think I can help the Senator out, if he would care to have me do so.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Vermont explain the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. I happen to have that matter under my eye at this moment.

Mr. OVERTON. I should be very glad to have the Senator give the information.

Mr. AUSTIN. The post-card form set forth in the existing law, section 3, reads as follows:

----- (Date).
Secretary of State of -----
Being on active duty in the armed forces of the United States and desiring to vote in the coming election, I hereby apply—

Mr. OVERTON. Is the Senator reading the form in the act of 1942?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

I hereby apply for an official war ballot.

My home address is -----
(Number and street)

in the city, town, or village of -----,
in the county of -----, in the State of -----,
and my voting district or precinct, to the best of my knowledge, is -----
I desire that the ballot be sent to me at the following address: -----

And then there is a place for the signature.

Signature certified by: -----

(To be signed by any commissioned officer.)

The form and substance of the application or post card that is found on page 42 of the Green-Lucas bill is quite different. Under the one I have read from the existing law, no serviceman could get a ballot for a primary in any State where the closed-primary method is followed, as it is in many Southern States and in my own State of Vermont. The application for an absentee ballot for a primary must state what party primary ballot the voter desires, and, under the law of my State, he can get no other than that for which he asks. That is the only way we have found to keep the two primaries separated.

There is nothing of the kind contemplated in the existing law, and that is one of the important differences between the existing law and the Green-Lucas bill. The Green-Lucas bill provides a method of voting in a State primary, and that is very important to us in Vermont, because historically it happens that the primary practically concludes the political controversy.

Mr. OVERTON. If the old post cards are used, the form provided for by the law of 1942, the soldier who gets the post card will be laboring under a disadvantage as against the soldier who gets the form provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. He would be at a great disadvantage. One of his disadvantages would be that he could not possibly vote in a primary in the State of Vermont.

Mr. OVERTON. The old post cards, it would seem to me, should be destroyed, and the new ones alone be used.

Mr. AUSTIN. I assume that if the bill shall become a law, the soldier will be given the new post card, and informed that if he desires to vote in a primary he will have to use it.

I call attention to line 6 of the application on the post card found on page 42 of the bill:

(6) My choice of party primary ballot is -----

(Fill in only in case of primary ballot)

That is one of the points of departure.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his explanation, but I think that there should be taken into consideration in this connection the fact that on page 43, section 202, appears the following language:

Such post cards (and post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment) may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as applications for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws.

So it is desirable to change the language in line 3, on page 42, in order to correspond.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what I called attention to was in response to the interrogatory of the Senator from Louisiana. It was not my intention to make an observation adverse to the amendment. I am firmly persuaded that our efforts to give the soldiers opportunity to vote, where the votes will count, will fail to a substantial degree if we do not adopt a law which contains the proposed form and substance of application for ballot. Whether it be the Green-Lucas bill or some other bill makes little difference; I am firmly persuaded we cannot conform to such a statute as the one I now read, which is section 142 of the Public Laws of Vermont:

Separate party ballots: The names of all candidates of a party for United States Senator, Congressman, State and county officers, and town representatives shall be printed upon separate ballots headed by the name of the party of which they are candidates. A person voting at such primary shall indicate to the ballot clerk his party choice, and such ballot clerk shall give him the ballots of such party and no other.

That theory is carried out in many other statutes setting up the semiclosed primary like that of the State of Vermont, and in the absentee ballot provisions of the statute, section 93, is this language:

When such application is used in applying for ballots at a primary election it shall provide a space for inserting the party ballots desired.

So far as our experience in Vermont goes, everything we could do to keep the primary a pure primary politically has been done, and we could not expect that State to completely upset a policy which was established only after we had held a referendum of the people, if I remember correctly. It is my recollection that we submitted to the people the question of whether we would have that type of closed primary before we adopted it, and having adopted it and operated for years under it, I doubt very much that the legislature in special session would completely reform and change the primary law.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont if it would not meet his suggestion if on page 43, in line 6, after the word "ballots", the words "primary or otherwise", were inserted?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the Senator to repeat the suggestion.

Mr. GREEN. On page 43, line 4, begins section 202, which reads as follows:

Such post cards (and post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment)—

That is, the existing law—

may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws.

If we insert after the word "ballots" the words "primary or otherwise," does not the Senator think that would make it clearer? It seems to me it would cover the point raised by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think it would not make it clearer. I think it would not change the situation. Nothing need be done more with the Green-Lucas bill, by way of amendment, as I see it, to enable the soldier to obtain a primary ballot. It is already provided for in line 6 of the post-card provision.

Mr. GREEN. As I stated before some 12,000,000 post cards have already been printed and are available. Some of them have been distributed. It would be necessary, then, to destroy all that have not already been put into circulation, and to recall the others, and print 12,000,000 entirely new ones. It would make for confusion if those which are already in existence are used, or have already been used, which I doubt, or which may be used easily, and, in order to avoid that contingency, if the Green-Lucas bill shall become law, of course the departments would immediately stop issuing the old post cards and begin issuing and distributing the new. In the meantime there is absolute confusion and to avoid that confusion I suggested the amendment. It is otherwise quite unimportant. In one place we will have the new cards and the old cards used, and in another only the new cards. That is the confusion I wish to avoid. But it is not a matter of primary importance except as to the cost and the distribution of the old and new cards.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I really think it is important. As I now think of it, after hearing the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, I believe he should not press his amendment, because, as I interpret it now, if it were in the law, the Secretaries of War and the Navy could elect to leave the subject of application for an absentee ballot upon the application they have already issued or may hereafter issue under Public Law 712. If they did that, no soldier would have an opportunity to vote in a closed primary, because he could not indicate which ballot he wants by the old form of application which I read into the RECORD in the course of my remarks a few moments ago.

Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island would do well to withdraw his proposal.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have such a high regard for the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I will withdraw the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 46, to strike out, in lines 16 and 17, the words "which polled at least 10 percent of the votes cast" and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "which had a candidate for President." As amended the paragraph beginning in line 12 on page 46 would read as follows:

Nothing in this section shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must, if requested, be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which had a candidate for President in the most recent Presidential election.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator send his amendment to the desk so it may be read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. LANGER. I send my amendment to the desk, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, in lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to strike out "which polled at least 10 percent of the votes cast" and to insert "which had a candidate for President."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment on my amendment. As the subparagraph is now worded the Socialist or the Communist or the Prohibition or any of the minor parties are barred. In other words under the language as now drawn no candidate, except candidates of the Democratic or Republican Parties, could broadcast. I believe that any minority party, whether I agree with its principles or not, should have the same privileges as a party which is wealthier and can afford to pay for broadcasts. For example, I do not believe it would be fair to have the candidate of the Democratic Party or the candidate of the Republican Party condemn over the radio the candidate for President on the Socialist ticket, and not give the candidate on the Socialist ticket a chance to be heard in reply. In view of the fact that we are fighting for democracy I believe that in the matter of rebroadcast, any party, regardless of whether we individually agree with its principles, ought to have the same opportunity of being heard as any other party.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It does not seem to me that the amendment which the Senator offers would accomplish the objective he desires, because, after being amended as the Senator proposes, the language would be:

Equal time must, if requested, be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which had a candidate for President in the most recent Presidential election.

It seems to me that what the Senator is trying to do is to provide for each political party which has a candidate in the Presidential election, not which had a candidate 4 years ago. It seems to me the right should extend to candidates who are running this time. If parties do not put up candidates for President they certainly ought not to have time in which to broadcast.

Mr. LANGER. I will frankly say that I prefer the language which the Senator from Ohio has indicated, but I figured the chances were I could not obtain agreement to such language.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment was originally drafted by me, and I left the provision wide open. Then representatives of the War Department came to me and said that they could not handle three or four or five broadcasts, and they suggested that the language be "10 percent of the votes cast." I have no particular feeling about the matter except that I do not think the

provision should apply to parties which had candidates for President in the most recent Presidential election, but should apply to parties which have candidates in the current election.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I accept the change suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota so modify his amendment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. The Senator will recall that this is his amendment, and if the Senator from Ohio agrees to and accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not agree to anything. I am trying to clarify the issue. I objected to the way the amendment was originally offered. I have no feeling about the matter one way or the other. I agree with the view taken by the Army. I do not wish to take a position on the Senator's amendment except I wish to have it perfected in the form in which I am sure the Senator from North Dakota wants it.

Mr. LUCAS. Frankly I have not discussed the amendment with the representatives of the Army because I was under the impression that the Senator from Ohio had gone over it very carefully with them as well as with the representatives of the Navy, and I was willing to accept, and I did accept the words as the Senator from Ohio proposed them. But if the Senator from Ohio has no particular objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota I do not think I shall have.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota as modified.

Mr. WHITE. My attention was distracted for a moment and I did not hear precisely the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I propose to amend it, the subsection beginning in line 12, on page 46, would read:

Nothing in this section shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must, if requested, be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which has a candidate for President in the current Presidential election.

Mr. WHITE. There is no provision, is there, as to how the time is to be controlled by the political party which has a candidate for President?

Mr. LANGER. No. At the present time only the Republicans and the Democrats could broadcast. Under my amendment Norman Thomas could broadcast, for example, as candidate of the Socialist Party, or the candidate for President on the prohibition ticket could broadcast, or the candidate for President on the Communist ticket could broadcast, or the candidate for President on

any other minority party could broadcast.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not wish to oppose the amendment, and I am not opposing it, but I suggest to the two Senators who have been interested in the preparation of the amendment that they are entering a most troublesome field. The law gives the right to candidates for public office to utilize the radio facilities of the country, and there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate a bill which proposes to deal further with the same subject matter. There have been lengthy hearings on the bill, and there has been sharp controversy and a sharp divergence of views as to what was the wisest thing to be done. I personally feel it would have been much better if the whole subject of radio time and of the utilization of radio by candidates could have been left to the consideration of the Interstate Commerce Committee for its recommendation as to legislation, but I do not know of any harm that the proposal would do. I think it is in dubious form, and just how it would be administered I do not quite see.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I regret I cannot accept this recommendation. I recognize the purpose of the amendment, which is to see to it that no candidate for President shall be excluded from communicating in this fashion with the voters in the armed services, but the consequences of the amendment, as proposed, are far-reaching. If it becomes the law of the land I think we may anticipate that a dozen or 20 men seeking publicity will have little organizations nominate them for the Presidency and then obtain free radio time to speak whenever the Republican or Democratic candidates for President speak—not because they expect to be elected, not because they expect to obtain votes, but merely because they expect to get free advertising.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not understand that even candidates for President or any political party represented by them would get free radio time. They all have to pay for it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. As the law now stands, provision is made for the use of the radio only by duly qualified candidates for public office. The provision is that if a particular radio station gives time to a duly qualified candidate for public office, it must give equal opportunity to every other duly qualified candidate for the same public office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when the Senator says "give," does that mean free of the ordinary charges for radio broadcasting?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or does it mean that if it accords to any candidate a given

length of time, it must accord to any other candidate the same opportunity, but that all of them must pay for it?

Mr. WHITE. No obligation rests upon any station to give time to any candidate. But if it does so in one instance it must give equal opportunity to every other candidate for the same office, and "equal" in that sense undoubtedly means under the same conditions and in like circumstances.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is now the law.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; that is now the law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish the Senator from Rhode Island would feel that he could take the amendment to conference. The bill must go to conference in any case, and it seems to me it would be unfair to exclude the candidate of minor parties from having any access to radio time. It may be that the amendment, as the Senator from North Dakota has offered it, is too wide open, but at least it would let the matter be considered in conference. It seems to me that there further consideration could be given to the question involved and that if the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is not in proper form, it could be modified. But it seems to me that on its face we should not take the position of excluding nominees of established minority parties from access to radio time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have another suggestion to make now in order to meet the objection of the Senator from Rhode Island. Let us have the language read as follows:

Representatives of each political party which has a candidate for President appearing on the ballot of at least six States in the current Presidential election.

Mr. GREEN. I will accept that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from North Dakota accept the modification?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on page 48, I move that the words in line 1 "polled at least 10 percent" and in line 2 "of the votes cast" be stricken out, and that inserted therein be the words:

has a candidate for President in at least six States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, all the language we have been discussing and the language which has just been discussed in connection with the pending amendment was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and was incorporated verbatim. I think that if the Senator

from Ohio would state his reaction to the suggestion, it would be helpful.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment is the same as the other amendment. As a matter of fact, my original amendment was wide open. It was at the request of the War Department that we restricted it. I think the Senator's objection is fair—that it should apply to only bona fide candidates of bona fide parties in the Presidential election.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator suggest a limitation?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I suggest the same limitation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is proposing it.

Mr. LANGER. I accept the modification.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Jackson	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Dannaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment dealing with the question of information for our soldiers overseas, which I think, as this debate progresses, is becoming one of the most important matters with which we shall be faced. I feel sure that Senators on both sides will desire that there shall be the most meticulous care that no coloring shall enter into the dissemination of news by the Office of War Information. My amendment is addressed to that purpose.

On page 48, after line 14, I propose to add the following paragraph:

Provided further, That the Director of the Office of War Information shall name a con-

sultant upon overseas information, upon the nomination of the national committee of any political party having a candidate for President in at least six States—

I should have preferred the 10-percent limitation, but I am now making this amendment conform to the provision which has just been adopted—

who shall be paid a salary at the rate of \$6,000 per annum, and shall be kept fully informed as to the policies and practices prevailing in the compiling and distribution of information for our forces overseas.

Mr. President, I think the purpose of the amendment is very clear. I feel sure, from my own association with Mr. Davis and Mr. Sherwood, with whom my relations have been most cordial, that there will be no failure on their part to do their utmost to be entirely nonpartisan. I have spent some time in the New York office of the Office of War Information, and have seen the vast organization which functions there. It occupies 10 floors of 1 building, and is engaged in compiling and distributing information. I have seen the fruits of its efforts all over the world, in the form of small sheets which are published telling the story. I certainly do not intimate that there will be any failure on the part of either Mr. Davis or Mr. Sherwood to do their utmost to be entirely nonpartisan; but I believe that they themselves would feel much clearer if there were consultants representing the major political parties, with full information as to what is going on, and who would be able at any time to call attention to anything which they might consider possibly prejudicial.

I offer the amendment in the hope that it may seem calculated to serve the very great objective which we have in mind.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the time I made the motion to lay before the Senate the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, which motion was voted upon twice, I was under the impression that certain Senators voted against that motion because it was their desire that the Green-Lucas bill be perfected; and when the Green-Lucas bill was perfected, according to their view, the logical thing to do would be then to join issue with the House and take up the amendments to Senate bill 1285 and act with respect to those amendments as a majority of the Senate may determine. I believe that thought was very well presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the parliamentary situation now occupied by Senate bill 1612, namely, it having been read the third time, do I correctly understand that it is no longer open to amendment as an independent measure?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rules an amendment could be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the point I was discussing earlier. I am sorry to disagree with the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as to the final procedure; but it seems to me that the only way we can be sure of challenging the attention of the House is to attach this amendment to the other bill which is pending.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the Senator from Michigan agree with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated earlier in the day, it has seemed desirable, and still seems desirable, to dispose of the pending bill by its passage. Immediately upon the disposition of the pending bill, if the bill is passed, it will be in order to move immediately to take up the House amendments to the other bill and let the Senate act upon those amendments. I will join with the Senator from Louisiana or any other Senator in such a motion.

I may add that, after conferring with members of the other body, it seems desirable that such a course be pursued. The same result would ensue. The Senate would no doubt be willing to put into the House amendments whatever it is willing to pass as a substantive piece of legislation. No harm could possibly come from the passage of this bill, and then the inclusion of the substance of the bill, or the identical language, as an amendment to the House amendments to the other bill. The House would not be expected to consider both bills. The natural thing would be for the bill to which the amendments were attached to go to conference. If a conference committee were able to work out a bill acceptable to both Houses, Senate bill 1612 would, of course, need no further attention.

If by any reason Senate bill 1285 should be deadlocked in conference, or if it should be passed in a form which would not enable it to become a law, there would still be before the House the bill which the Senate had passed, to which other amendments might be attached in an effort finally to work out a bill which would enable the soldiers to vote.

So I hope the Senate will proceed, now that the bill has been read the third time, to final disposition of the bill. Imme-

diately upon that having been done, we can take up the other bill with the House amendments. For that reason, if the Senator from Louisiana is now preparing to move to have laid before the Senate the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, I hope that that motion will not be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, it seems to me that the argument advanced by our able majority leader is subject to this objection: If we are now to proceed to act finally on Senate bill 1612, and if we are to pass Senate bill 1612, it is not impossible, if we take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, that we may agree to the House amendments, or concur in the House amendments with certain modifications.

Then the Senate would have two conflicting measures which it had adopted. I say it would not be impossible, in view of the closeness of the vote which has heretofore prevailed on controversial issues in connection with Senate bill 1612.

However, that may be, Mr. President, as to point of time, Senate bill 1285 ought first to be taken up, and the House amendments to it then be considered. The Senator from Rhode Island or the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator can propose the Green-Lucas bill as an amendment to the House amendments. If that were done we could take up Senate bill 1612 and could dispose of it. But what we ought to do is to meet the issue which we tendered to the House, and which the House has sent back to us. We ought to vote on the House amendments to the bill which we so carefully considered, and which the other House so carefully considered. We ought to see whether there is any difference between the Senate and the House on the issue, and if so, what the difference is.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to pardon me for a brief observation. I regret that the Senator is about to make the motion, in view of the fact that the Senate rejected the same kind of a motion both on Friday last and today.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will agree, however, that no question is settled until it is properly settled.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, but I say to him with all the sincerity I possess that in view of the fact we now have the Lucas-Green bill to the point where no other amendments to it can be perfected, it seems to me that the country is entitled to know how the Senate of the United States stands on the issue which is now before it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me say that the country will readily know as soon as we take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285. We have to take them up anyway.

Mr. LUCAS. No; the Senator is incorrect, because there we have two propositions. If the Senator will permit me to make a further observation, the pending bill is as different from the bill which

Senators are now trying to have taken up—the Senate bill with the House amendments—as night is from day. I repeat that the country wants to know where the Senate of the United States stands now on the question of the Federal ballot. If we are going to take action now on the House amendments to the other bill, the country will never know how we stand on the pending bill, because we can always say, "Well, I voted for another measure in preference to that one."

I should like to know now, after we have reached the point where all the perfecting amendments have been agreed to, whether the Senate of the United States is willing to give the Federal ballot—yes or no—to the men of the armed forces overseas. That is the real issue, and I sincerely hope that the Senator will withhold his motion.

Mr. OVERTON. What the people of the United States are much more interested in is, not so much how the Senate stands, but how the Congress of the United States stands. The only way they can know how the Congress of the United States stands is for both Houses to meet in conference, and the quickest way to have them meet in conference is, not to meet in conference on Senate bill 1612, but to meet in conference on Senate bill 1285. Then a legislative determination of the issue can be had so the people of the country may know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not mean to say, does he, that if they never meet in conference, the Senator's motion to concur will be agreed to?

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator moved to have them meet in conference, and then he proposed a motion to keep them from meeting in conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly. I propose to vote for the House amendments; and, as the Senator knows, they come up one by one, and are voted on one by one. If we concur in the House amendments, the country will know how we stand on this proposed legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senate were to agree by unanimous consent to a motion to have laid before the Senate the House amendments to the other bill, before the Senate took a final vote on the pending bill, would the Senator from Louisiana agree to have the Senate vote at once without further debate, on the amendments which will be offered as substitutes for the House amendments?

Mr. OVERTON. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I asked the Senator whether he would give unanimous consent, so far as he is concerned, to that proposal?

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator mean to vote on the House amendments without any debate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; to vote on the House amendments and on any amendments which may be offered thereto, as-

suming that the language of the Green-Lucas bill as now perfected will be offered as a substitute for the House amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. And is offered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not know that I can agree to that because I certainly would not want to undertake to bind the other Members of the Senate on such a proposal. I think the thing to do is to determine, and then let the unanimous-consent request be made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I myself, can see that there would be no advantage in laying the pending bill aside now, to take up the House amendments and dispose of them and then immediately afterward return to consideration of the bill now pending, and vote on it. We have this bill before us now. The logical thing to do is to dispose of it, and then take up the House amendments.

If I may make another suggestion to the Senator, we have no assurance, even if we were to substitute for the House amendments the language the Senate has agreed to in the Lucas-Green bill, that there would be a conference on it. It would be up to the other House to determine whether it would agree to hold a conference. We cannot guarantee that.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the answer to all these objections is that it is in the interest of expedition to take up the House amendments to Senate bill 1285. It would be in accordance with the uniform custom of parliamentary procedure. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the House amendments to Senate bill 1285 be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. His general pair and the transfer thereof have been announced.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—50

Bailey	Ellender	Revercomb
Ball	Ferguson	Reynolds
Bankhead	George	Robertson
Bilbo	Gerry	Russell
Brewster	Gurney	Shipstead
Brooks	Hawkes	Smith
Buck	Hill	Taft
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McCarran	Tobey
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Byrd	McKellar	Wheeler
Capper	Millikin	Wherry
Caraway	Moore	White
Chavez	Nye	Willis
Connally	O'Daniel	Wilson
Davis	Overtown	
Eastland	Reed	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Jackson	Pepper
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Barkley	Kilgore	Stewart
Bone	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tunnell
Danaher	Maloney	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	Wallgren
Guffey	Murdoch	Walsh, Mass.
Hatch	Murray	Walsh, N. J.
Hayden	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—7

Andrews	Glass	Scrugham
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	
Gillette	McNary	

So Mr. OVERTON's motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move to reconsider the vote just taken by which the motion of the Senator from Louisiana was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1285.

Mr. TAFT. I ask for separate consideration of the House amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments are divisible. The clerk will state the first House amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the word "armed", it is proposed to strike out "services of the United States, members of the merchant marine of the United States or serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have a copy of the House amendments. I have not seen a copy as yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that copies will be sent to all Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the House amendments were printed and put on the desks of Senators earlier today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is there any motion before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first House amendment is now before the Senate. There is no motion pending.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that motion I wish merely to make a brief statement. It is my purpose when we reach amendment numbered 3 to move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment, substituting for the language of amendment numbered 3 the text of the Green-Lucas bill as now perfected. That will throw the whole matter into conference. It seems to me to be the part of wisdom for the Senate, in order that the whole question involved in this proposed legislation may be in conference, to disagree to the other amendments so that they will likewise be in conference. That will throw the whole subject into conference, not only the language that we substitute, if we do substitute it, for amendment numbered 3 but amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and so on.

If we agree to the House amendments they will not be in conference, as Senators all know. If we disagree to them they will be in conference.

Personally I see no objection to amendments numbered 1 and 2, but, in order that the entire subject may be in conference we ought to disagree to them and have the entire subject in conference, if it is to go to conference, which I hope it will, and I think probably it will. Therefore, as the separate amendments are reached, I hope the Senate will disagree to them so that we may have the entire subject for the conferees to deal with when they reach that point.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. It is the understanding that if we disagree to the House amendments, other than the third amendment, the Senator will urge the adoption of the Green-Lucas perfected bill as an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my purpose to move when we reach amendment numbered 3 to offer the text of the Green-Lucas bill as a substitute for it. I was simply urging that all the other amendments be disagreed to, so that not only the subject of these proposed amendments may be in conference but all the amendments of the House may be in conference.

Mr. WHITE. I agree with what the Senator has suggested. I merely wanted to understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that; and that is the logical way to proceed if we want this whole subject to be in conference with the latitude that the conferees ought to have in dealing with the entire problem. I hope the other amendments will be disagreed to as they are reached, and naturally I hope that the substitute which I shall offer for House amendment numbered 3 will be agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it in order to agree or to disagree to the amendments of the House separately?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are four motions which could be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Chair state them again?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very glad to do so. In the order of their priority the four motions are: To refer to a committee; to amend; to agree; to disagree and ask for a conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I think the Chair should state that the motion to agree carries with it also the priority motion to concur with an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, that to amend would be in the second category of priority. It would have the same effect as agreeing with an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that I for one think that the Senate should concur in the House amendments. Why should we disagree to the amendments, if the Senate desires to agree to them? Let us take the very first one. I doubt that there are any Senators who are opposed to it. It would strike out the words "services of the United States, members of the merchant marine of the United States or serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are", and insert "forces of the United States or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots or the United Service Organizations outside the United States and."

I cannot imagine how the Senate could vote against that amendment. It is a perfectly proper amendment, and if the Senate desires to agree to it, why should it be disagreed to? Why should we disagree to something which we do not honestly believe should be disagreed to?

Mr. President, I think it is very proper to bring these various amendments up separately, take them up in their order, and vote on them. Therefore I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the first amendment, and see whether or not the Senate concurs in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I dare say that in the long and honorable service of the Senator from Tennessee, in both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, on several hundred occasions he has made the motion that the House or the Senate, as the case may be, disagree to a Senate amendment to a House amendment, and that the bill be sent to conference. I have heard the Senator do it repeatedly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that I have no recollection of it now. I should like to know when I ever did that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator does it in connection with nearly every appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; we agree to many House amendments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The ordinary practice in getting a conference in

the first place is for one body to disagree to all the amendments of the other House, unless there is a desire to select some particular amendment to agree to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri contending that consistency is an attribute of statesmanship?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not so contending; I think consistency is the bug-a-boo of little minds.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to suggest a thought in this case, because it is a unique case. We are asked to vote on an amendment in the second degree, because it is proposed that we vote to consider an amendment to the House amendment. Under those circumstances it seems to me that the best way is to consider each amendment on its merits and eliminate as many controversial questions in conference as we can, because already we have come to such a point that the House may well say, "What you are proposing is an amendment to our amendment which is completely inconsistent with the bill you yourselves sent us in the first place." It seems to me the situation is different from any heretofore presented, and we might well consider the amendments on their merits as we proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not agree with what the Senator from Ohio says. We have all seen each body, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, reverse themselves, on occasions, two or three times in the course of an hour. So there is nothing, so far as the legislative record is concerned, that is of any importance.

What I rose to point out was that we all know that the bill must finally be written in conference. We all know that is the only way a bill can ever be actually agreed upon. Any proposal, finally to become a law, must be actually formulated in conference.

The effect of agreeing to a motion to concur is to limit the scope of the conference. The effect of agreeing to a motion to disagree is to extend the scope of the conference and the authority of the conferees. If the motion which the Senator from Kentucky intends to offer to the third amendment, to concur with an amendment embodying the perfected present Green-Lucas bill, should be adopted, and the bill should go to conference, then, if the Senate had disagreed to the other House amendments, it would give the conferees the widest possible latitude. On the other hand, a motion to concur is simply a motion to restrict the authority of the conferees on certain more or less unimportant details.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understand the argument of the Senator, it is that when we get to the third amendment we will agree to it or disagree to it and amend it. In other words, the Senate will act on that as it believes it should act, or as a majority directs, but the Senator is

virtually asking unanimous consent that we disagree to all the amendments, which some other Senators might very much favor, and vote on only the third amendment. I do not think that should be done. I think we should vote on the House amendments as we reach them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not asking unanimous consent for anything. I am addressing an argument to the purpose of giving the conferees the widest possible latitude, if the bill shall finally go to conference. I think everyone agrees that if it does not go to conference, we will never have a law on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Maine yield to me to make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri and other Senators?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Amendments numbered 1 and 2 are not fundamental. Amendment numbered 1 merely enlarges the field of the operation of the law by including the Red Cross and some other organizations. Personally, I have no objection to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to it, either. I was arguing the question whether we should give to the conferees the widest possible latitude.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to interrupt?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment. Amendment numbered 2 merely proposes to add the words "primary, special, or" before the word "election." I do not think that is fundamental, and personally I have no objection to it.

My reason a moment ago for suggesting that we disagree to all amendments was that that is nearly always done. So far as I am concerned, we might pass on amendments 1 and 2 and dispose of them, and I myself will vote for them. Then we will come to amendment numbered 3, on which the whole controversy hinges. I desire to get a vote on the first two amendments, and I hope I may then offer an amendment to the third.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want a vote on amendment No. 1. We cannot vote on No. 2 until we reach it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in amendment numbered 1, and the yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should at least like the privilege of saying one word in my own time, as I had the floor and yielded to the majority leader.

I desire to suggest that the proposal of the Senator from Missouri went too far, in the suggestion that we disagree to everything, but particularly it seems to me that the prestige of this distinguished body, if it has any remaining, would certainly be served if we could at least go to the extent of giving considerate attention to amendments proposed by the House to a bill which we sent to them. Merely to return it to them with a complete disagreement does not indicate that deliberateness which should characterize us in the very uncomfortable position in which I think

everyone considers we find ourselves. So I think that if we gracefully concur, as the majority leader suggests, in a few of the House amendments, the House may not be as facetious about our action as otherwise might be the case.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So long as the Senator from Maine seems to be animadverting on my statement about the usual practice, does not the Senator think it was in derogation of the dignity of the Senate for the House to insist, before we ever had a chance to read their amendments? The ordinary good parliamentary practice in such a case would be to wait for us to act on the amendments. They did not do that in this case. They insisted on their amendments and asked for a conference. When the Senator is talking about the dignity of bodies, he had better go into the whole subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Anything the Senator may point out about the weaknesses of the other body is entirely agreeable to me, but I want the Senate to retain its own dignity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in amendment numbered 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to concur in amendment numbered 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the second House amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The second House amendment is on page 2, line 9, after the word "any", to insert "primary, special, or."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the second House amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate agree to House amendment numbered 3, with an amendment striking out all the language of amendment numbered 3, and inserting language which I send to the desk, which is the completed Lucas-Green bill, on which a third reading was ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sorry that in spite of the length of time I have been in the Senate I am not so familiar with parliamentary procedure, and I wish to ask a question. Does a motion to agree to an amendment have priority over a motion to agree with an amendment? If so, I wish to make the motion that the Senate agree to House amendment numbered 3. As I said, I must confess my own ignorance of parliamentary law. It has never appealed to me particularly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair holds that a motion to agree with an amendment takes priority over a motion to agree to an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky open to amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is open to amendment in one more degree.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place I have not had an opportunity to examine the amendment [laughter] or understand exactly how the Senator from Kentucky is proposing to handle the matter. I do not know how he proposes to handle the third amendment of the House. The third amendment of the House is to strike out some 15 lines and to insert a long recommendation with respect to the States. Does the Senator leave that amendment in, and then add to the House words provisions dealing with the Federal ballot.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; my amendment contemplates striking out all the language in amendment numbered 3, which goes over to the top of page 10, and to substitute the language of the amendment which I have offered, which is the perfected Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that does not appear in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. What does not appear in my amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand that the Senator makes an oral motion to agree to the third amendment of the House striking out and inserting, and then adding at the end the language which is in the so-called Green-Lucas bill, or does he strike out the language of the House amendment and insert the language of the Green-Lucas bill instead of the language inserted by the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I propose to strike out the language of the House amendment and, instead of it, to insert the language of the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, simply as a parliamentary matter it does not make sense when language is inserted in that manner. The English of the proposal does not even work. Does the Senator restore the language which the House struck out, or does the Senator strike out that language in the House amendment and the original Senate bill and insert the language of the Green-Lucas bill only in lieu of the italicized matter?

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment numbered 3 of the House is an integrated amendment which strikes out certain language and inserts other language.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is as a substitute for that amendment numbered 3 that I offer the Green-Lucas bill as perfected.

Mr. TAFT. So the effect of the Senator's motion is to restore the original Senate language; is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not necessarily so at all. In view of the form of the amendment there may appear on the surface to be some incongruity as between the substitution of the completed Senate bill and the House amendment, but the adoption of the motion puts the entire subject into conference, in which any apparent incongruities as between the House amendment and the Senate language can be adjusted.

Mr. TAFT. But still I want to know exactly what it is the Senator is doing with this amendment. The third House amendment begins, in line 12 on page 2, and it strikes a number of lines to the top of page 3 from the original Senate

bill, and inserts some five or six pages of language to the top of page 10. What I wish to know is whether this amendment is entirely rejected, or what part of it is concurred in? Does the Senator concur in the part to strike out, and amend the part that is inserted? Does he leave stricken out the matter which the House has stricken from the original Senate bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. The effect of the amendment which I have offered is to substitute the language of the Green-Lucas bill for the language of House amendment numbered 3, which strikes out some of the original language of the Senate bill and inserts four or five pages of its own, running from page 3 to the top of page 10.

Mr. TAFT. So then, as I take it, the Senator accepts the amendment of the House striking out the original Senate language. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I do not think so, because we do not take that language out of conference. If we accept the House amendment striking the matter out it is no longer in conference.

Mr. TAFT. But the Senate cannot reject the House amendment with an amendment. I can only concur in the House amendment with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have moved to concur in the House amendment numbered 3, with an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That leaves it all in. Mr. BARKLEY. No; there is substitution of language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader a question. If I understood his motion correctly, it was that we concur in the House amendment, with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. By striking out certain language in the House amendment and inserting the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is proposing to strike out, if I understand him correctly, all of amendment numbered 3 which was in the Senate bill, including the italicized part, which was added by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the effect of the motion, I think.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. How can the Senator move to concur if he proposes to strike out all the language contained in the amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. From a parliamentary standpoint one can move to concur with an amendment which strikes out all the language and inserts other language.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BARKLEY. The effect is to strike out all the language inserted by the House as new language in italics and insert the language I have offered in its place.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I will yield in a moment. I certainly do not want this proposal to be in such a situation that it does not mean anything. The way the language will read, under the Senator's proposal, is as follows:

Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces—

And so forth—

who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any primary, special, or general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war, and in order to afford ample opportunity for That Public Law Numbered 712, 77th Congress, be amended by inserting after the enacting clause the words "Title I"—

And so forth. It does not make any sense as a matter of English language, and it is left hanging in the air with no action taken on it at all. It may be in order, because materiality makes no difference in the Senate, but certainly it is a perfectly stultifying performance to frame a bill in such a way that it does not even read in the ordinary form of the English language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to propound another parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky is to agree to amend, as I understand it. Is it possible for the Senate to agree to a motion to concur in amendments, when it is evident from the very motion the Senator makes and the argument which he makes that what is intended is to strike out, rather than to concur? In other words, has he the priority to make the motion to strike out the House language by a motion to concur and amend? The Chair has held that the reason why it has priority is because the Senator has moved to concur and amend. As it seems to me, there would be no concurrence in anything the House has done, but the motion is one to strike out and to insert something else in place of that amendment. Under those circumstances, in my judgment—which is perhaps very poor, because I am not at all a parliamentary expert—unless the Senator leaves the language in, his motion does not have priority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that I may clear up the situation, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee and to other Senators that if a motion had been made simply to concur in House amendment No. 3, and if nothing else had been done except to move concurrence in that amendment, it would then have been in order for me to move to concur in or agree, with an amendment; and that motion would take precedence over a simple motion to concur. What I have done is to make this motion first; and even if another motion to concur were made, the motion I have made would have to be voted upon first.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that may be true. I am willing to have the Senator's motion voted on whenever it is in order. But certainly the Senator cannot say that he moves to concur in an amendment, when his real motion is to strike out and to insert a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me perfect my motion so that we may all understand what it is. With respect to that part of House amendment numbered 3 striking out certain language on pages 2 and 3 of the Senate bill, it is not essential, from a technical standpoint, that it be voted on, except that the motion I make is to concur in that amendment, with an amendment by way of a substitute. In order that that may be cleared up, let me say that my motion is that the Senate concur in House amendment numbered 3, with an amendment to strike out all the language in subsection (a) beginning on page 3, and going over to the top of page 10, and to substitute the amendment I have offered in lieu of that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that, as I understand the Senator's motion, its effect would be to restore the Senate language down to line 7 on page 3, by rejecting the whole House amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Then, of course, Mr. President, the Senator has two entirely separate titles II; because the Green-Lucas bill has in it a whole title II about State voting, and now he has restored everything that is in the original Eastland amendment as to title II about State voting. That also seems to me very illogical. It may be material to have two sets of plans for State voting, but certainly it does not seem very logical.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to address an inquiry to the able majority leader in respect to his motion and his proposed amendment. Is the amendment which he proposes to substitute for House amendment numbered 3 the Green-Lucas bill as perfected, including all amendments adopted up to and including the time of the third reading?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of that situation, is a motion in order, as a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Kentucky, to defer action on the pending motion until tomorrow at such time when the proposed amendment can be printed, so that the Senate can inform itself as to what its contents are? So far as I know there is only one copy of it, which is the copy offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say that I join in the request. I have prepared an amendment to this amendment. But it is almost impossible for me to tell whether it will fit. I am a little more anxious to make it fit than the Senator seems to be to make his amendment fit the House amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have already made a parliamentary inquiry, but my inquiry has not as yet been answered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to answer first the parliamentary inquiry made by the Senator from Arkansas. A motion made by the Senator to postpone to a day certain is in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, then I move that the Senate postpone further consideration of the pending amendment until tomorrow, when the Senate reconvenes, and that in the meantime it be printed and be made available to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Arkansas is to postpone to a day certain. The motion is debatable.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, which I also ask to have printed and made available for tomorrow's consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be received, and will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Ohio whether the amendment he now offers to the amendment is the same as the one on which the Senate voted a few days ago.

Mr. TAFT. It is substantially the same. It contains a few minor differences.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the pending motion one to amend the motion made by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky was the pending motion, at which time the Senator from Arkansas made a motion to postpone to a day certain. That is the motion now before the Senate, and it has priority over other motions until it is disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the motion of the Senator from Arkansas prevails, will it be proper immediately to proceed to vote on Senate bill 1612?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business would recur for the consideration of the Senate, if that motion should prevail.

Mr. McFARLAND. And the unfinished business is Senate bill 1612; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say that everyone knows what is in the amendment I have offered, and everyone knows what is in the amendment the Senator from Ohio has offered to my

amendment. Senators who have been in the Chamber and who have kept informed of the proceedings as they have gone on day by day, and as amendments have been adopted by the Senate, know what they are. They have been contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as issued each morning, for the information of Senators who were detained or who for other reasons were compelled to be absent from the Chamber when the Senate acted upon the amendments. It seems to me that the issue is simple. I am sure every Senator is in a position to vote intelligently upon the motions which are before the Senate. I hope the motion to postpone the consideration of these amendments until tomorrow will not prevail.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the motion of the Senator from Arkansas does prevail, will it not put the Senate in exactly the position for which the Senator from Kentucky has been making request all day?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would, in a sense, because it would then be in order to vote upon the pending bill, Senate bill 1612, which has been advanced to its third reading, and which cannot be further amended without unanimous consent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Although that is true, it seems to me it would be marching up the hill and then turning around and marching down again, after the Senate decided it wanted to consider the amendments first, now to decide to postpone consideration of the amendments.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is not responsible for going up the hill; nor is he responsible for coming back down the hill on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been trying, in my modest way, to get the Senate to go up the hill.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator has been unable to do that. Now we have an opportunity to get back to where I think we should be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the motion in detail. I hope we may conclude this business today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay consideration or postpone a vote on this measure; but certainly it is true that there are many things in the bill of which many Senators are not aware. We have been amending it for 2 days. I think it would be some advantage if it could be printed and we could take another look at it before we finally send it to the House. However, I prefer not to postpone consideration, because I think there will be some debate on the question, and we might as well proceed to debate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the amendment suggested by the Senator from Kentucky were to prevail, would the language of the original Senate bill found on page 2, beginning in line 12 and ending in line 7

on page 3, be in the bill as returned to the House, or would it be eliminated by the Senator's amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That language would be in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. How about the language added by the House in line 7 on page 3, and continuing to the top of page 10? Would that language be in conference?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be.

Mr. RUSSELL. Therefore the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is proposed to be tied on at the end of the House amendment found on page 10.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky was designed to provide that the language of the committee amendment to the Green-Lucas bill, as amended, should take the place of certain language included in the House amendment, commencing in line 10 on page 3.

Mr. RUSSELL. What would then become of the House language in lines 7, 8, and 9, on page 3?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language would be in conference. Would the Senator's motion eliminate that language?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the effect of it is to retain lines 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. RUSSELL. Therefore the language proposed by the Senator from Kentucky would strike out all the House language on page 3, commencing in line 10, and insert the matter suggested by the Senator from Kentucky?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. And extending to the top of page 10. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me see if I correctly understand the Chair. I understood the Chair to say that the language "such persons to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible" would be left in the bill under the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky if it were agreed to by the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that that would be a part of the whole Senate amendment which would go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then the effect of the motion of the Senator from Kentucky is to strike out that which the House struck out, and that which the House put in. In what possible way could it be an amendment to section 3?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Chair pass on one question before the next one is reached?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that the doing of thing mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee would constitute an amendment, and would be within the second category of priority.

Mr. McKELLAR. What about the concurrence? The concurrence provided for by the rule is left out entirely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The effect of what is proposed by the Senator from Kentucky is to amend. It is considered as an amendment of the House amendment, and comes within the second category of priority. If that were voted down, then a motion to concur without amendment would be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that be the case, does not a motion to concur in the House amendment have priority over a motion to amend?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not this the situation: The effect of the House amendment is the exact equivalent of an ordinary motion to strike out and insert; and so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, it is in exactly the situation contemplated by rule XVIII, which provides:

but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a digested proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert—

Now we come to our present situation:

but pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

As I see the motion of the Senator from Kentucky, what has happened is this: He has made a motion to concur with an amendment, the amendment being to strike out a portion of the language inserted by the House amendment, and to insert in its place certain other language, which is clearly in order under the general parliamentary practice and specifically under rule XVIII of the rules of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair agrees with the statement made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very much confused. I should like to pose this question to the Chair: In sending a bill to conference, is it necessary that all the language contained in the bill make sense? I am serious about that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that the answer to the question propounded is "No," and that the conferees would have authority to make any germane amendment if the matter were in conference.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I understand, in answering the parliamentary inquiry made a few minutes ago regarding what would be the effect if the

motion I made were adopted, the Chair stated that instead of further consideration of the pending measure, Senate bill 1285, the unfinished business then, would be the consideration of Senate bill 1612.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not have that purpose in mind. I did not wish to interfere with or delay consideration of the pending measure. I thought we would proceed to the consideration of further amendments. I am most sincere in what I said about the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky. I do not believe that all Senators are familiar with all the amendments or have had time to study their possible effect on the pending legislation. I refer to the amendments which have been adopted to the bill which the Senate has been considering, Senate bill 1612, which is now offered by the able Senator from Kentucky as an amendment to the House amendments to Senate bill 1285. I thought we might consider the other amendments. If my motion would have the effect stated by the Chair, out of deference to the able Senator from Kentucky, and in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of this measure—although I think we ought to have the opportunity to study as complicated and lengthy an amendment as the one offered—I feel compelled to withdraw the motion. However, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the pending bill, and that the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky go over until tomorrow and be printed before the Senate votes upon it, in order that we may be fully informed as to its contents and what its effect would be if adopted. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment go over until tomorrow and be printed and laid on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if consent were granted I regret to say to the Senator from Arkansas that it would be the same as voting on his motion to postpone the vote until tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will recall, he knows that I suggested that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the pending bill. I am sure that could be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator refers to Senate bill 1285.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; there are other amendments to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senate cannot wisely determine what it will do with other House amendments until it has disposed of the pending motion on the amendment now before the Senate. For that reason I regret that I cannot consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Have the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio and the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky both been reported to the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio was received and ordered to lie on the table. It has not been reported to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood the Chair to rule that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio was in order to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did rule that it would be in order, but the Chair understood the Senator from Ohio had not offered the amendment, but only presented it to lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did so because the Senator from Michigan desired to offer an amendment ahead of my amendment, so I did not formally offer my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to make an announcement with respect to the advice given by the Chair in response to an inquiry made awhile ago, that if the motion of the Senator from Arkansas should prevail the effect would be to restore to the present consideration of the Senate the unfinished business.

It is the opinion of the Chair that the Chair was in error in giving the advice, but in view of the fact that more than one of the House amendments is pending, the disposition of this particular amendment would not prevent the Senate from consideration of other House amendments which have already been laid before the Senate by the action of the Senate. So the Chair would like to correct the advice given to the extent that, in the opinion of the Chair, if the motion of the Senator from Arkansas were to prevail, the next order of business would be some other unconsidered amendment of the House amendments which has not as yet been disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I propound the parliamentary inquiry whether the Senator's motion was to postpone further consideration of my motion until tomorrow, or to postpone consideration of the amendments of the House which have been laid before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Arkansas restate his motion?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, my motion was to defer action on the pending amendment until tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's motion pertains to amendment numbered 3, and not alone to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was about to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair when I was taken off my feet. I wished to ask if the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky had been reported to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been reported.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Georgia that the motion was made by the Senator from Kentucky and elucidated by him, but it was not actually reported by the clerk at the desk.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was present at the time the amendment was offered, and I wish to know why the amendment was not reported under the rules.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that it was not reported because the Chair understood the explanation of the Senator from Kentucky had acquainted the Senate with the nature of the motion, and no Senator having called for a repetition of it, it was not reported. The Chair will be very glad to have it reported.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not any Senator have the right to have the amendment reported, as well as the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I concede that any Senator has a right to have an amendment read.

Mr. RUSSELL. My point is, Mr. President, that we might save time by allowing this matter to go over until tomorrow, and not completing its consideration today. In the meantime, the substitutes to be offered could be read by Senators.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to rule on the request of the Senator from Georgia. Does the Senator from Georgia request that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky be reported?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. President; I think it would be well to have the amendment reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the reporting of the amendment I have offered or the reporting of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I have no serious objection to this matter going over until tomorrow. However, I wonder if we could arrive at an agreement to limit debate on the pending question tomorrow so that we might bring it to a prompt conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have not objected at any stage of the proceedings to a limitation of debate. So far as I am concerned, I have been ready to vote on the entire proposal for the last 10 days. However, I do not think that the Senate should proceed to act on the bill until it has opportunity to see it as it will appear when and if the amendment shall be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of the pending amendment be postponed until tomorrow, and that further debate on the pending question, and all motions relating to amendments to the pending amendment, or to any other House amendments or amendments thereto, be limited to 20 minutes; that during the further consideration of the House amendments to Senate bill 1285, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes upon any motion or amendment, or any amendment thereto.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator's unanimous-consent request contemplate that the pending bill shall go over until tomorrow as the unfinished

business, and that we will not recur to the consideration of Senate bill 1612?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to make the suggestion that this matter ought to go over until tomorrow. We should have these two bills before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Please wait a moment. I should like to be heard briefly, and I think I have a right to be heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I do not think we should have to pay a price in this matter. I do not see any reason in the world why we cannot vote on all these amendments tomorrow. I certainly have no desire to delay, but I do not like to be met by the offer of a price for which the majority leader will allow the matter to go over until tomorrow, namely, that we will consent to a unanimous-consent request limiting debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

There are two matters of the most urgent importance to come before the Senate this afternoon. One of them is the conference report on the tax bill. I put that first, although I have charge of a conference report which has been already submitted to the Senate. It pertains to the bill for the regulation of foreign labor. The life of the law has expired and in the bill there is a section making our action retroactive. It is very important that the conference report on the tax bill, and the conference report on the bill to which I have just referred, be agreed to this afternoon. It will take all the time we have left this afternoon to dispose of the two matters.

So I suggest to the Democratic leader that consideration of the pending matter be allowed to go over until tomorrow just as it is, and not upon the payment of a price. I was not present the other day when an agreement was reached with respect to limitation of debate. If I had been, there would not have been a limitation. I think we would have saved time by not having a limitation, because everyone knows no long speeches have been made during the debate.

So it seems to me that consideration of the bill would be expedited by letting it go over, and allowing the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to present the conference report on the tax bill. It is very necessary that the conference report be agreed to, and that the bill become law at the very earliest possible moment. I hope it will not take long, and when it has been disposed of I shall very meekly and humbly suggest that the conference report on the foreign-labor bill, which we have been working on for months, be taken up and disposed of. It seems to me that the majority leader ought to be willing to allow the pending matter to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I coupled two proposals with my request for a unanimous consent agreement. Nothing was further from my mind than that I was offering a price to any one for anything. I was seeking to facilitate the early consideration and disposition of this entire subject. I stated a while ago that I think every Senator knows now how he is prepared to vote on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, on my motion, or on any other motion which may be made, and, in order to facilitate an understanding, so that Senators who leave the Chamber this afternoon would know what to depend upon tomorrow, I simply asked unanimous consent that the pending matter go over and that debate be limited to 20 minutes to each Senator. I cannot see how that involves any price.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to object to it whether it involves a price or not. I regard it that way. I make objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has a right to object. Of course I could insist that the Senate vote now upon the motion of the Senator from Arkansas, if it is still pending; but, without regard to any limitation of debate, I now ask unanimous consent, in order that the Senator from Georgia may present the conference report on the tax bill and that the Senator from Tennessee may present a conference report on an appropriation bill, that the pending question and all other questions involved in the House amendments to Senate bill 1285 as well as the further consideration of Senate bill 1612 go over until tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Reserving the right to object, is it intended that if we get into a debate upon the conference report on the tax bill or the conference report the Senator from Tennessee is going to submit—

Mr. BARKLEY. Both those propositions are privileged. The Senator from Georgia can rise at any time and bring up his conference report and I am hoping now that we will dispose of that and also of the other conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make an inquiry of the able Senator from Kentucky. Would the Senator's motion permit or preclude the printing of these amendments?

Mr. BARKLEY. It did not specifically state as to that; but I couple with my request that the amendment I offered be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senate that it is the practice for amendments to be printed, and they will be printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. They are printed under the rule, of course.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan, if that is what he is about to inquire about, that my proposal would not preclude him from offering from the floor his amendment to the amendment prior to the time it was voted on.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have it lie on the table and be printed so that all the Senators will have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There can be no objection to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask that the two amendments to the amendment of the majority leader from Kentucky lie on the table and be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire if my request was granted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

THE REVENUE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 3687, the Revenue Act of 1943, and move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The report was read.

(For conference report on House bill 3687, the revenue act, see the proceedings of the House of Representatives of February 7, 1944, pp. 1314-1325.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, after a conference lasting less than a week the managers on the part of the Senate and House came to full agreement on the revenue bill of 1943. Differences between the House and Senate bills, especially important with respect to renegotiation, were settled in a spirit of harmony and cooperation.

REVENUE ESTIMATES

It is estimated that the revenue bill of 1943, as agreed upon in conference, will increase net Federal receipts by \$2,315,200,000 in a full year of operation at calendar year 1944 levels of income and business activity. This sum exceeds

the yield of the bill as it passed the House by \$175,900,000, and is \$39,600,000 greater than the yield of the Senate bill. Practically all the increase in yield over the bill as it passed the Senate is attributable to the conferees' action in agreeing to rates of certain excise taxes somewhat higher than contained in the Senate bill. Under the bill as agreed upon in conference it is estimated that net Federal receipts will total \$40,840,200,000 in a full year of operation, compared with \$38,525,000,000 under existing law.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

With respect to individual income taxes, it will be recalled that the Senate struck out the House provisions for a minimum tax which would have been substituted for the Victory tax in order to retain on the rolls those persons now subject only to the Victory tax. The Senate retained the Victory tax but made the rate 3 percent for all persons, regardless of family status. The Senate version represented at least a small measure of simplification over present law, and avoided introducing an entirely new method of computing taxes at the present time. While the House bill made certain changes in the withholding rates and exemptions, the Senate bill retained those provided in existing law. On these provisions affecting individual income taxes the House conferees receded.

The House conferees also receded on the Senate amendment which excludes from gross income mustering-out payments for military and naval personnel. The House conferees receded with respect to Senate amendments which lighten the penalties, and permits the use of the previous year's income, in connection with the estimated tax, with respect to the exclusion from gross income of certain cost of living allowances paid to civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed outside the continental United States, and with respect to repeal of the second windfall tax provided in the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

The Senate struck out the provision in the bill as it passed the House relating to the taxation of back pay attributable to prior years. The House conferees receded from their disagreement to this amendment, and agreed to it with an amendment which broadens the section so that it will now apply to back pay received from any source so long as the amount of the back pay received during the taxable year exceeds 15 percent of the gross income of the individual for such year.

The so-called hobby loss amendment contained in the Senate bill was modified in conference so that the limit on the deduction for such losses is raised from \$20,000 to \$50,000, exclusive of deductions for taxes and interest. The provision will be applicable only when losses of more than \$50,000 have been sustained in each of 5 consecutive years.

CORPORATION INCOME AND EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

With respect to the excess-profits tax on corporations, the Senate bill differed from the House bill in that the credit allowed on invested capital over \$200,-

000,000 was retained at 5 percent as in existing law, rather than the 4 percent provided in the House. The House conferees receded with respect to this Senate amendment. Under the bill as agreed to in conference, the credit allowed on invested capital will compare as follows with that provided under present law:

Invested capital (in millions of dollars)	Credit (percent)	
	Existing law	H. R. 3687
Under 5.....	8	8
5 to 10.....	7	6
10 to 200.....	6	5
Over 200.....	5	5

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendments extending the last-in first-out inventory method to include taxable years beginning in 1941, to the amendment restoring former treatment of partially worthless bad debts, and to the amendment permitting deductions for corporate contributions to veterans' organizations.

The House conferees receded with an amendment from their disagreement to the Senate amendment permitting corporations emerging from receivership or bankruptcy to use the capital structure of the predecessor company for tax purposes, and the amendment assuring that certain reorganized companies shall not have the basis of their property reduced by the amount of indebtedness canceled in the receivership process. The effect was to provide this relief for 1943 and subsequent years, and to provide for no gain or loss to the shareholder upon the receipt in 1943 of new securities for the old securities. A Senate amendment, providing that fraternal organizations exempt from income tax shall not be required to file returns, was agreed to by the House conferees.

The conferees agreed to retain the Senate amendments relating to the credit for surtax purposes for dividends paid on preferred stock of utilities, to the taxation of gains resulting from the disposition of radio broadcasting property pursuant to orders of the Federal Communications Commission, and to the taxation of income from the sale of timber.

The Senate had added talc and barite to the list of minerals for which percentage depletion is allowed for the duration, and made the depletion allowance for potash permanent. These provisions were retained. The House conferees receded from their disagreement to the Senate amendment redefining gross income from mining operations, with an amendment so as to include the ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product.

The Senate had partially rewritten the provision contained in the House bill designed to close a loophole in existing law which permitted certain tax benefits through the acquisition of corporations. The Senate language was, in general, agreed to by the conferees, with the

major exception that it was made effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1943, rather than retroactive for cases of fraud. It was further provided that determination of the law applicable to taxable years prior to 1944 shall be made as if this section had not been enacted, and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section was not expressly made retroactive. The House conferees insisted, and the Senate conferees receded, with respect to the Senate amendment excluding a corporation engaged in the transportation of natural gas by pipe line from the definition of a natural-gas company entitled to special treatment under the excess-profits tax.

EXCISE TAXES AND POSTAL RATES

In the House bill the tax on admissions was established at 2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof, and in the Senate bill at 1 cent for each 5 cents or major fraction thereof. On this amendment the House conferees receded. The tax on cabarets was made 30 percent, as in the House bill, rather than the 20 percent provided in the Senate bill. In connection with the tax on jewelry, the House conferees receded with respect to the Senate amendment exempting from the increase in rate watches selling at retail for not more than \$65 and alarm clocks selling at retail for not more than \$5, while the Senate conferees agreed to restore the exemption contained in the House bill of silver-plated flatware from the jewelry tax.

The House conferees agreed to the lower rates of tax provided in the Senate bill for furs, toilet preparations, and bowling alleys. The taxes on furs and toilet preparations were made 20 percent, and the tax on bowling alleys was made \$20 per year per alley, rather than 20 percent of the charge for bowling, as in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the higher rates of tax provided in the Senate bill for leased wires and for wire and equipment service, and with respect to electric light bulbs and tubes, a compromise rate of 20 percent was agreed upon. Similarly, a compromise rate of 20 percent was provided in the case of the tax on luggage, handbags, and so forth.

The Senate action in striking out the tax on parimutuel wagering contained in the House bill was agreed to by the House conferees. The Senate bill contained a provision exempting servicemen from the tax on cabarets, but as it was felt this would be extremely difficult to administer, the Senate conferees were persuaded to recede. The House conferees receded with respect to the Senate amendment exempting billiard and pool tables in hospitals from tax if no charge is made for their use. The drawback on distilled spirits used in the manufacture of certain nonbeverage products was made \$6 in the Senate bill, whereas in the House bill it was \$5. The result of the Senate's action was to make the tax on such spirits \$3 as compared with \$4 in the House bill. On this provision the House conferees receded.

In connection with increases in postal rates, the Senate bill had stricken out

the provision contained in the House bill increasing the rates on third-class mail. The House conferees agreed to this amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS

A Senate amendment broadening for the duration the class of duty-free imported newsprint was agreed to by the House conferees.

The House conferees receded with respect to the Senate amendment freezing for the calendar year 1944 the rates of certain social-security taxes.

SUMMARY AND AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO WHICH SENATE CONFEREES RECEDED

Naturally, in the consideration of matters so important as those involved in this tax bill, it was necessary for the Senate conferees to recede with respect to a few of the amendments adopted in the Senate. It should be of interest, however, that of the 311 total of Senate amendments, the House conferees either accepted completely, or receded with an amendment, with respect to 269, while the Senate conferees receded from only 42 amendments, some of which were clerical.

We were unable to persuade the House conferees to agree to the amendment desired by the Senator from Pennsylvania relating to reorganization by adjustment of capital and debt structure of an existing corporation; to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico concerning income from potash mines or deposits; the amendment by the Senator from Ohio pertaining to the loss on the sale or exchange of securities of certain railroad-company subsidiaries; to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri relating to the unused excess-profits credit in the case of certain reorganized railroad companies; or to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois providing for a refund of the luggage tax to avoid double taxation. Likewise, the Senate conferees found it necessary to recede with respect to the amendment relating to gains and losses from involuntary conversions and from the sale or exchange of certain property used in trade or business, with respect to the amendment introduced by the Senator from Kentucky concerning the priority of payments under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, and with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey providing for quarterly payments of the unforgiven tax under the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. I believe this covers the important amendments with respect to which your conferees receded.

In regard to the renegotiation provisions, I will discuss some of the important provisions.

First. One of the most important changes made by the Senate and agreed to in conference was the one relating to the termination date. The House conferees accepted our termination date of December 31, 1944, with power in the President to shorten or lengthen the date, but in no case beyond July 1, 1945. There were certain minor changes made, but these related to determining what profits were attributable to the period

before the termination date, and what profits were attributable to the period after the termination date.

Second. We agreed to the House provision allowing review by The Tax Court of the United States instead of the Court of Claims. However, the House conferees accepted the Senate provision which did not allow any review for cases closed by agreement. The House conferees also agreed in principle to the Senate provision for taking amortization allowances into account in connection with excessive profits determinations. To get the benefit of the provision, the amortization allowance must be recomputed for tax purposes first, and the recomputed amortization allowance reduced by the tax benefit is then refunded to the contractor or subcontractor.

We were unable to induce the House conferees to agree to the following, with reference to certain factors required to be taken as standards by the renegotiating board:

1. Problems in connection with reconversions should be a factor to be taken into account in determining excessive profits.
2. The factor as to the profits remaining after the payment of estimated Federal income and excess-profits taxes.

On both those amendments the Senate conferees receded.

The provision in the Senate amendment that the factors used in determining excessive profits be published was adopted.

The House accepted the repricing provisions, with the exception of the criminal penalty, which would put a person in jail for failure to deliver articles at the price fixed by order.

It is also made clear that the repricing provisions apply to war brokers.

A provision was adopted which carries out the intent of existing law that there is no authority to renegotiate the profits accruing to a company by reason of the increment in value of its long inventories, that is, inventories over and above its normal requirements to fulfill existing contracts.

Recurring to the repricing provisions in the bill, there is no termination upon that authority, broad as it is, given to the departments, except the termination of the war in the usual language in which provision is made for the ascertainment of the end of the war.

The House had an amendment exempting canned, bottled, or packed fruits or vegetables from renegotiation. The Senate had an amendment exempting processed dairy products from renegotiation. Both amendments were disagreed to in conference. It was believed that the \$500,000 over-all exemption would take care of most of the canners or processors.

We were unable to get the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment exempting machine tools, having a life of over 10 years, from renegotiation. The definition of subcontract as contained in existing law, and in the Senate bill, was adopted, except that office supplies were specifically exempted from the articles coming within the subcontract definitions. It is understood that office sup-

plies are now exempt under administrative interpretation.

We have received some complaints from contractors whose total contracts for the fiscal year aggregate slightly over \$500,000. For example, a contractor might receive total amounts for his fiscal year aggregating \$510,000. While this would make his contracts subject to renegotiation, it is not intended that the renegotiation shall reduce such amounts received below \$500,000, and, on inquiry, I find that that is the disposition of certain of the departments charged with renegotiation.

The language of the statute is "contracts aggregating \$500,000 received or accrued", and it has been pointed out by at least one of the secretaries that it would be easy in the case of contracts totaling just a little more than \$500,000 for the contractor to decline to receive that amount, in which event his total contracts would not be renegotiated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of expressing my very great appreciation and approval of the report of the committee, which he, as its chairman, has made, concerning the renegotiation of contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR FOR 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. I submit the conference report on House Joint Resolution 208, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) "making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 19, 22, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE "WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"For assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities essential to the prose-

cution of the war, \$30,000,000, which sum, together with the amount appropriated in the Act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), shall be merged into one fund, to remain available until December 31, 1944, and to be expended by the War Food Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator"), appointed pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9334, dated April 19, 1943, as follows:"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "including the furnishing of health and medical services to (a) agricultural workers and their families housed in any labor supply center operated as a part of this program, or (b) migratory agricultural workers and their families who, without recruitment or assistance of any Government agency, have entered the area served by any such labor supply center and are engaged in agricultural work in such area, and to whom adequate health and medical services are not otherwise available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "the repayments from employers for such advances to be created to the funds available to the Administrator; (4) determination and payment of claims (not exceeding \$50 in any one case) of workers recruited in foreign countries (a) who, in preparation for transportation to or from the United States and subsequent failure of such transportation, have suffered losses, or (b) who have been transported to the United States and during said transportation, including embarkation and debarkation, have suffered the loss of or damage to personal effects"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure "(4)" in said amendment, insert the following: "(5)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert the following: "(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to enter into agreements with the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States to furnish, on behalf of the United States, for domestic interstate agricultural workers and their families and foreign agricultural workers and their families, while such workers are employed within any such State, any or all of the following services or functions which such State extension services are willing to undertake: Health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, supervision, protection and shelter, maintenance and keeping of records of compliance with contracts and international agreements or treaties respecting such workers, and health and medical services for agricultural workers and their families encompassed by clauses (a) and (b) of subsection (a) (2) of this section. The Administrator may require the modification or determination of any agreement with any such extension service whenever he finds such action to be necessary in order to carry out the terms of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States of

America is signatory. Whenever a satisfactory agreement cannot be negotiated with any such extension service, or pending the negotiation of an agreement, or whenever the Administrator finds it necessary to terminate an agreement, he shall carry out the foregoing responsibilities and functions with respect to such workers and their families by direct expenditure by the War Food Administration. The Administrator shall allocate to any State extension service from the amount made available by this section, in the manner provided in section 2 of this title, such funds as may be necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities agreed upon by the Administrator and such State extension service under the provisions of this subsection. The Administrator is further authorized, in connection with the purposes of this subsection, to loan to any State any labor supply center and the facilities and equipment thereof, owned by the United States, under such terms and conditions as he may specify."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "one and one-half per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "or seasonal agricultural products"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment and the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "title, except as otherwise provided herein,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For the purposes of this title the War Department may utilize the Administrator and the Extension Services in the respective States to make such investigations and certifications with respect to the need for utilizing prisoners of war and the emergency use of soldiers of the United States and with respect to the terms and conditions of employment, as may be required by the War Department in order to assure that the terms of such treaties or international agreements are complied with."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"(k) The Act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out 'January 31, 1944' and inserting 'the date of enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 208 of the Seventy-eighth Congress'. All obligations incurred during the period between January 31, 1944, and the date of the enactment into law of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms of such Public Law 45, as amended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment and after the words "agricultural products," insert the following: "including the timber and lumber industries, and," and in line 53 of the matter inserted by said amendment before the colon and the words "Provided further", insert the following: "for which provision is made in title I of this Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TAEER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
D. LANE POWERS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to point out the principal changes which have been made by the conferees. Question was raised as to the amount of the appropriation. It was fixed by the Senate at \$35,000,000, and it was fixed by the House at \$27,000,000, in addition to the unexpected balances from the last calendar year. The conferees compromised somewhat by fixing the amount at \$30,000,000 in addition to the amount of unexpended balances of last year.

The next item of importance will be found on page 2. The House had fixed \$17,500,000. The conferees agreed to an amendment providing not less than \$14,000,000 and not more than \$18,500,000.

The next item is on page 3. The amount to be invested in new buildings was decreased from \$200,000, as passed by the House, to \$100,000, and the amount for services in that connection was reduced from \$40,000 to \$20,000.

The next matter of any importance is in regard to medical supplies. The conferees agreed on an amendment which moderated the language of both Houses.

At the bottom of page 6 we find the next item. The House had provided an appropriation of \$200,000 for administrative purposes. The conferees agreed on 1½ percent instead of 2 percent, as fixed by the Senate.

The next item is on page 9. A prohibition was entered against setting up permanent regional offices, and that was agreed to.

The proposition that the receipts from workers might be used as a revolving fund was agreed to.

There was an amendment offered, as I recall, by my friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] regarding the use of wood pulp. I shall desist at this point and ask him to explain that to the Senate, and then I shall ask for a vote on the conference report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with respect to title II of the bill it was agreed to as it passed the Senate, with the clarifying words that it should include

the lumber and timber industries. That was the only change made in the amendment, and it was made in order to make it perfectly clear that the aliens imported for that purpose, as I mentioned on a previous occasion, would be employed in that type of industry and in getting wood pulp for paper and for box shock needed for apple and orange boxes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona whether I am correct in my understanding that to a very substantial degree the conference report represents the views of the Senate committee and of the Senate itself.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct. The House conferees were very generous in yielding as they did.

Mr. WHITE. I know that the proposed legislation had very careful consideration in the Senate committee, and that it received a somewhat thorough discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. And in the full committee.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to be sure that in the main the conference report responds to the Senate's thought.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It does.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona has concluded his observations, will he yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I was merely answering a question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to report to the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the Senate conferees that this morning General Smith of the General Staff of the United States Army called upon me in reference to an amendment to the conferees' amendment to amendment numbered 42. He requested that it be further amended so as to strike out the words "the Administrator and Extension Services in the respective States", and to substitute therefor the words "any Federal agency", and so as to place a period after the words "War Department", and to delete the words next following, and so forth.

Without going into the details, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum on the matter be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That the conferees' amendment to Amendment No. 42 to House Joint Resolution 208 be further amended so as to strike out the words "the Administrator and the Extension Services in the respective States" and substitute therefor the words "any Federal agency," and so as to place a period after the words "War Department" and to delete the words next following, which read "In order to assure that the terms of such treaties or international agreements are complied with." The amendment referred to will then read as follows:

"For the purposes of this title the War Department may utilize any Federal agency to make such investigations and certifications with respect to the need for utilizing prisoners of war and the emergency use of soldiers of the United States and with respect to the terms and conditions of employment, as may be required by the War Department."

NOTE.—The purpose of the above amendment, which is requested by the War Department, is to make it permissible for the War

Department to utilize the fact-finding and fact-determining assistance of any appropriate Federal agency in helping the War Department to determine the most useful allocation of prisoner-of-war labor in relation to the total wartime manpower requirements of the Nation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have a copy of the memorandum. Of course, it is perfectly satisfactory to have it printed in the RECORD, but the suggestion came too late and could not possibly be included in the conference report.

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes. Of course, I understand it is too late, but I desired to have the RECORD show, if it be agreeable to the conferees present and to the Senate, that our purpose was to make the language elastic, not restrictive, so that the rule of reason could apply. I discussed this matter with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who may want to elaborate somewhat on the subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that when this matter was brought to my attention, the way it appealed to me was that all that the conferees had done in accepting the House amendment was permissive. It says that for the purposes of this title, the War Department may utilize the Administrator and the Extension Services. If the War Department, in allocating the use of prisoners of war, desires to seek information from any other place or from any other source in the Government, it is perfectly at liberty to do so.

I called up Representative CANNON, chairman of the House committee, and that is exactly his determination. There seemed to be an idea in the War Department that, because we mentioned these two agencies of government, namely, the War Food Administrator and the Extension Services, that meant the War Department could not ask anyone else about it. That does not follow at all. It is incumbent upon the War Department to make the wisest and best possible use of war prisoners; and if there is information available anywhere—from the War Manpower Commission or from any other source of the Government—which would influence the War Department's judgment, it is not only at liberty to secure such information, but is bound to do so.

So it is a permission which has this effect: Prior to the enactment of the legislation, the only way a prisoner of war could be obtained was by previous consultation with the War Manpower Commission. Instances were brought to the attention of the committees wherein crops had been lost because it took so long to have the request go through all the channels. This is a short cut which permits action to be taken if the War Department feels inclined to do so. The suggestion is that it is the right thing to do, but the provision would not compel the War Department to do anything, and it would not limit the sources of information relative to what the War Department should do.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. By virtue of the language "services essential to the preservation, marketing, or distribution of agricultural products," is title II intended to cover forest products?

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to make that perfectly certain, we inserted, in the conference, the words "including timber and lumber industries," so that it would cover all forest products.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that, under the provisions of the proposed act, Canadians with a contract to cut forest trees for pulpwood or for other forest products would be eligible to enter the United States? They would be eligible, would they?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. That is exactly what was intended to be done. We were advised that there were sources, including those the Senator mentioned, and that there were also certainly lumbermen who could be obtained from Newfoundland, and that there were available from British Honduras approximately 600 men who have been in Scotland cutting the pines which grew during the period between the two wars, and that those men were returning to their homes. The idea was that men who were engaged in cutting mahogany in tropical forests and who were skilled lumbermen could be brought into this country to help with respect to the wood-pulp situation and the situation with respect to box shock, in view of the fact that we are so short of boxes in which to pack apples and citrus fruits and vegetables.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

MAJ. GEN. PATRICK JAY HURLEY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that, as in executive session, the nomination of Brig. Gen. Patrick Jay Hurley to be major general, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, be considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2

Don C. Bliss, Jr., of Mississippi.
Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia.
William R. Langdon, of Massachusetts.
Alfred T. Nester, of New York.
Albert F. Nufer, of New York.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3

Donald F. Bigelow, of Minnesota.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Marcel E. Malige, of Idaho.
Renwick S. McNeece, of Utah.
Warwick Perkins, of Maryland.
J. Bartlett Richards, of Maryland.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4

H. Merrell Benninghoff, of New York.
Gilson G. Blake, of Maryland.
Joseph F. Burt, of Illinois.
Reginald S. Castleman, of California.
Vinton Chapin, of Massachusetts.
Prescott Childs, of Massachusetts.
Charles H. Derry, of Georgia.
C. Paul Fletcher, of Tennessee.
Winthrop S. Greene, of Massachusetts.
William N. Gwynn, of California.
Eugene M. Hinkle, of New York.
Clarence E. Macy, of Colorado.
E. Talbot Smith, of Connecticut.
Francis H. Styles, of Virginia.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5

Sidney A. Belovsky, of New York.
Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah.
Augustus S. Chase, of Connecticut.
William P. Cochran, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Gerald A. Drew, of California.
Monroe B. Hall, of New York.
Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa.
Perry N. Jester, of Virginia.
Kenneth C. Krentz, of Iowa.
J. Hall Paxton, of Virginia.
Guy W. Ray, of Alabama.
Walter N. Walmsley, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert S. Ward, of Ohio.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts.
Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey.
Barry T. Benson, of Texas.
Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa.
William E. Flournoy, Jr., of Virginia.
Morris N. Hughes, of Illinois.
Miss Elizabeth Humes, of Tennessee.
C. Grant Isaacs, of Tennessee.
Robert Janz, of Oklahoma.
Charles F. Knox, Jr., of New Jersey.
Henry P. Leverich, of New Jersey.
Raymond P. Ludden, of Massachusetts.
Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts.
Patrick Mallon, of Ohio.
Robert Mills McClintock, of California.
Edward D. McLaughlin, of Arkansas.

Troy L. Perkins, of Kentucky.
Kennett F. Potter, of Missouri.
Joseph P. Ragland, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania.
Tyler Thompson, of New York.
Joseph I. Touchette, of Massachusetts.
William C. Trimble, of Maryland.
Whitney Young, of New York.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8 TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7

John L. Bankhead, of North Carolina.
M. Williams Blake, of Ohio.
Carl Breuer, of New York.
William F. Busser, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas S. Campen, of North Carolina.
David M. Clark, of Pennsylvania.
Harry M. Donaldson, of Pennsylvania.
Jay Dixon Edwards, of Oregon.
Perry Ellis, of California.
James Espy, of Ohio.
Richard D. Gatewood, of New York.
John L. Goshie, of New York.
John D. Jernegan, of California.
Hartwell Johnson, of South Carolina.
Easton T. Kelsey, of Michigan.
Andrew G. Lynch, of New York.
Robert B. Memminger, of South Carolina.
Charles S. Millet, of New Hampshire.
Bolard More, of Ohio.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Jack B. Neathery, of Texas.
Miss Katherine E. O'Connor, of Indiana.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Charles O. Thompson, of Alaska.
S. Roger Tyler, Jr., of West Virginia.
Woodruff Wallner, of New York.
Philip P. Williams, of California.
Robert E. Wilson, of Arizona.

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, UNCLASSIFIED, TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8

Roland K. Beyer, of Wisconsin.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Robert P. Chalker, of Florida.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
V. Lansing Collins, Jr., of New York.
Adrian B. Colquitt, of Georgia.
Thomas J. Cory, of California.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of Nebraska.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey.
John C. Fuess, of Massachusetts.
Boies C. Hart, Jr., of Connecticut.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George D. Henderson, of California.
John P. Hoover, of California.
Donald W. Lamm, of the District of Columbia.
Frederick J. Mann, of New York.
Delano McKelvey, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Mindee McLean, of Louisiana.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
Joseph Palmer 2d, of Massachusetts.
Richard H. Post, of New York.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
Robert C. Strong, of Wisconsin.
J. Kittredge Vinson, of Texas.
Alfred T. Wellborn, of Louisiana.
Charles H. Whitaker, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. William Myers Kasper, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. John Jacob Stark, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1937.

Second Lt. Boyd Blaine Chambers, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Edward Lawrence Corcoran, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Carroll Bernard McElroy, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. James Harper Walker, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Ben. Marshall West, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
PROMOTIONS EFFECTIVE FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1944

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

John C. Grier

Paul V. Joliet

To be temporary surgeon

James R. Shaw

To be temporary dental surgeon

William C. Neaf

To be temporary passed assistant dental surgeon

Howard K. Wyatt

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Patrick Jay Hurley

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art most holy, open our eyes that we may see the sin that encompasseth these times; arouse our courage, that we may without fear, denounce the evil which Thy truth reveals. Let us accept the light that Thou dost pour forth in the name of humanity's King and Lord.

For the lives and deeds which have come down to us from the past, grant that our hearts may breathe a most generous praise. Open our minds that we may welcome the unfettered truth: "The path of the just is as a shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." O Thou who canst not tolerate the shams of capital, the selfishness of labor, and the haughtiness of learning, make us humbly and reverently aware of our personal responsibility to Thee who art a God of stainless right and eternal triumphs. Dear Lord, our country is in a tragic struggle, far from easy, that freedom's dream may come true; the antagonisms of this day are very cruel and real. Above the contagion of earthly conflicts, reach forth Thine hand that the hounds of malice and hate may forever be defeated. Thou Christ, who appeals from every cot of pain, from the crowded street, weeps with every broken heart, and who art the inspiration of every redemptive effort, help us to do the brave deed and live the true life. In the name of our Saviour, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 4, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, seldom do I take the opportunity of asking unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks by inserting an editorial in the RECORD, and seldom do I seek the opportunity of advising my friends on the Republican side, but may I call to their attention a very fine editorial in the New York Times of February 5, 1944, on the soldiers' vote. It will do them all good to read it. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of that editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter on Japanese atrocities; also, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of an address on the problems of the development program for western Montana. The Public Printer informs me that this will cost \$100 more than the amount allowed. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two articles which appeared in the Yonkers Home News, one on January 25, 1944, and one on February 1, 1944, setting forth the fact that Yonkers, N. Y., had established a very important record in having no industrial disturbances or strikes since Pearl Harbor and before.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders and the business of the day is disposed of, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next, after other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Abraham Lincoln and Alexander H. Stephens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address delivered at the Republican Lincoln Day banquet at Plymouth, Mich., on Saturday, February 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DENATURALIZATION OF AMERICAN-BORN CITIZENS

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks by the inclusion of a resolution of the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALEOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a resolution adopted unanimously by the Des Moines Trade and Labor Assembly, January 16, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include portions of speeches made in the city of Ashland, Ohio, relative to the Korean movement. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed the limit by \$90. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAX REVISION AND SIMPLIFICATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the debate of the Committee of the Whole on the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bills, I may have the privilege of inserting letters and other documentary material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[Mr. POAGE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks that I expect to make on the Treasury Department appropriation bill and include a letter and a table which I received from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include